



1981

Shared-Caregiving Fathers in Intact Families: An Exploration of Personality Characteristics, Motivations, and Antecedents

Charles Wolfson
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wolfson, Charles, "Shared-Caregiving Fathers in Intact Families: An Exploration of Personality Characteristics, Motivations, and Antecedents" (1981). *Dissertations*. 2060.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2060

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1981 Charles Wolfson

SHARED-CAREGIVING FATHERS IN INTACT FAMILIES:
AN EXPLORATION OF PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS,
MOTIVATIONS, AND ANTECEDENTS

by

Charles Daniel Sirignano Wolfson

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

December

1981

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank all of the members of his dissertation committee for being very supportive throughout the planning, execution, and writing of this research. Specifically, he would like to thank Dr. Alan S. DeWolfe for serving as committee chair, and, in that role, answering all sorts of questions, major and minor, for helping the author to plan and understand the statistical analyses, and for voluntarily serving as a substitute interviewer when one was needed; Dr. Jeanne M. Foley for her continuing interest in and enthusiasm for the subject matter, for her help in selecting appropriate measures, and for her availability for everything from long chats about the meaning of the research to short answers regarding procedural details; and Dr. Dan P. McAdams for sharing his knowledge about the theory and measurement of social motives, for showing concern about the author's progress at each stage of the process, for scoring the TAT stories and providing a scorer for the interviews, and for insisting on the highest standards for the written product, which served to enhance its quality considerably.

A special acknowledgement is due Mirel Sacks, who patiently and carefully listened to hours of tape recordings in order to score the interviews as accurately as possible.

Finally, the author is deeply grateful to his wife, Sylvia Wolfson Sirignano, not only for reading through the manuscript and making constructive suggestions for its improvement, but for her unflagging

emotional support and encouragement through all the ups and downs of a seemingly never-ending endeavor, and for her belief, which helped to sustain this project, that shared child care is an undertaking that is worth both studying and doing.

VITA

The author, Charles Daniel Sirignano Wolfson, is the son of Irving Norman Wolfson and Annabel (Kreider) Wolfson, and the husband of Sylvia Wolfson Sirignano. He was born August 21, 1952, in Worcester, Massachusetts.

His elementary education was obtained in the public schools of Worcester, Massachusetts, and secondary education at North High School, in that city, where he graduated in June, 1970.

In September, 1970, he entered Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vermont. In September, 1971, he transferred to Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York, and in June, 1974, received the degree of Bachelor of Arts with a major in psychology. He was elected a member of Phi Beta Kappa in 1974.

In September, 1974, he entered the doctoral program in Clinical Psychology at Loyola University of Chicago and was granted a traineeship at Loyola University's Guidance Center and Day School. In 1975 he became a student member of the American Psychological Association. In September, 1979, he entered a clinical internship at Chicago-Read Mental Health Center. In October, 1979, he became a student member of the Illinois Psychological Association. In January, 1981, he was awarded the Master of Arts in Psychology. In November, 1981, he became an associate member of the Massachusetts Psychological Association.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
VITA	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	4
Introduction	4
Husband Participation in Housework and Child Care	6
Male Involvement with Offspring in other Species and Cultures	9
Attitudes about Sex Roles	11
Attachment and Responsiveness Between Men and Infants	15
Antecedents of Shared Caregiving in Fathers	22
Effects of Father Involvement on Children's Development	32
Summary and Hypotheses	35
III. METHOD	37
Subjects	37
Measures	40
Procedure	44
Scoring and Data Analysis	46
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	50
Hypothesis 1	57
Hypothesis 2	61
Hypotheses 3 and 4	64
Backgrounds and Experiences	67
Other Findings	70
Lifestyles	70
Attitude and Personality Measures	77

Adulthood Experiences	89
Early Life Experiences	93
Conclusions	97
V. SUMMARY	104
REFERENCE NOTES	107
REFERENCES	108
APPENDIX A	114
APPENDIX B	118
APPENDIX C	127

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	41
2.	General Lifestyle Differences Between the Groups	52
3.	Percentage of Child-Care Tasks Performed by the Fathers Compared to Their Wives	54
4.	Percentage of Household Tasks Performed by the Fathers Compared to Their Wives	56
5.	Sex-Role Questionnaire (SRQ) Scores for the Fathers	59
6.	Sex-Role Questionnaire (SRQ) Scores for the Subjects' Mothers as Perceived by the Subjects	62
7.	Intimacy and Power Motivation Scores	65
8.	Work Arrangements of the Subjects and Their Wives	72
9.	Child-Care Arrangements of the Subjects and Their Wives	75

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX A Personal Data form	115
APPENDIX B Interview	119
APPENDIX C Coding Key for Interview	128

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As long as it is women who are mainly in charge of children the double standard will survive. The harsh truth is that no societal compromise which changes other features of woman's condition while leaving her role as first parent intact will get at the roots of asymmetric privilege. (Dinnerstein, 1976, p. 76)

Dinnerstein (1976) has pointed out that "for virtually every living person it is a woman--usually the mother--who has provided the main initial contact with humanity and with nature" (p. 26). She argues that it is this condition, female-dominated early child care, that predisposes adult men and women to perpetuate the basically unequal sex-role arrangements of virtually all societies. Dinnerstein insists that only when infant care and early child care are shared equally by men and women will we change these arrangements and free ourselves from the limitations inherent in them. In fact, Dinnerstein sees the movement toward equal responsibility for child care as the core aspect of the "central human project...[of] sexual liberty" (pp. 10-11), by which she seems to mean freedom from gender-related role expectations.

Dinnerstein claims that because men are not as closely biologically related to infants as women, they feel a certain drive to use more complex, less biologically based capacities to nurture babies and young children. Until recently, Dinnerstein points out, men have acted on this nurturant urge primarily in indirect ways, as in initiation

rites and concern about having heirs. Modern conditions, according to Dinnerstein, make it not only possible, but essential, for men to express their nurturant urges in direct ways, as caregivers, alongside women, for infants and young children.

In American society, there appears to have been a shift in recent years toward slightly more father involvement in infant and young child care. This does not appear to be a large shift, however, and the mother domination of children's very early years that Dinnerstein describes appears still to be the prevailing arrangement. There are, nonetheless, a few men who have undertaken a different role, of sharing with their wives, to a very significant extent, the rearing of their young children. Even these men, in many cases, are not sharing child care equally, or at least they did not do so during their children's infancy and early childhood. But they begin to approach the ideal of equal caregiving espoused by Dinnerstein, and it is curious, given Dinnerstein's thesis regarding the effects of mother domination of early childhood (which these men no doubt experienced) on adult sex-role arrangements, that these men exist at all.

Dinnerstein's provocative writing about the necessity for the kind of child-care arrangement that these few men and their wives are undertaking or, at least, approaching, provided much of the impetus for the present research project. If Dinnerstein's thesis that shared child care is essential is correct, then one crucial question concerns how to bring this situation about: One aspect of that question is what will lead men to seek to share child-care responsibilities. The few men who

have chosen to share child care may provide a clue, for they have chosen to express directly their nurturant feelings toward their young children, despite the fact that their early rearing is likely to have been dominated by their mothers. The present project is a study of such men. The major questions it asks are: What are their personalities and attitudes like? How do their motivations differ from those of more traditional fathers? What are their backgrounds, particularly their social and familial experiences in childhood? How do they differ from most other men in these areas? In short, the overall purpose of the present research is to begin to discover some of the factors that led, directly and indirectly, to the choice of becoming a shared-caregiving father, and to begin to find out how shared-caregiving fathers are different from other fathers.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Very little literature exists regarding shared-caregiving fathers. In fact, until recent years, the psychological and sociological literatures virtually ignored the role of fathers with their young children. There is some literature specifically on shared-caregiving families, however, and other research provides a foundation for an exploration of shared-caregiving fathers, who have undertaken a role which marks a major shift in men's general sex-role behavior.

First, men's normative current involvement in family work is reviewed, particularly in regard to time spent in housework and in involvement with infants. This review shows the degree of involvement that American men generally have in domestic life, providing a reference point for an exploration of such involvement in the fathers in this study. In contrast to these norms of male involvement in domestic life, exceptions, in terms of male involvement in the care of offspring in other species and other cultures, are discussed next, along with the implications of these exceptions for American fathers' changing roles.

Men's and women's attitudes toward sex roles and sex-role change are then explored. This discussion reveals that most people, including social scientists, find it easier to accept women's role changes than

men's role changes. Sex-role socialization practices which foster these attitudes are discussed in the following section. These practices, as well as the attitudes of the general population and the scientific community, provide a sense of the context in which the fathers in this study grew up and now live their unusual lives.

The following sections of the review discuss research that pertains to the question of fathers' potential to share child care. First, infant attachment, especially to fathers, is explored, followed by a discussion of attachment and other forms of responsiveness to infants and children in both human and animal males. These studies suggest that the shared-caregiving fathers studied here may not possess a special responsiveness to children, but rather are manifesting an underlying capacity possessed by most fathers.

Although there has been little work on the subject, most of the existing research that has been done on the antecedents of shared caregiving in fathers is reviewed next. This research provides much of the basis for the specific questions asked in the present study. Other factors thought to be relevant to shared caregiving, particularly motivation, are also discussed. Dinnerstein predicts that shared responsibility for child care will have profound positive effects on human development. Some research directly relevant to the question of the effects of father involvement with children has been done, and some of these studies, along with others which are indirectly relevant, are reviewed next. Finally, the hypotheses of the present study, based on this literature, are presented.

Husband Participation in Housework and Child Care

Research has generally shown that men's involvement in "family work" (Pleck, 1979)--housework and child care--is minimal. In their classic study, Rebelsky and Hanks (1971) measured the amount of verbal interaction that fathers typically have each day with their young infants. The subjects were 10 infants, who were studied between the ages of 2 weeks and 3 months. The fathers were all in the lower-middle to upper-middle socioeconomic classes. Verbal interactions between the fathers and infants were recorded every 2 weeks for a 24-hour period. The mean number of verbal interactions in a 24-hour period was 2.7; the mean amount of time that fathers spent verbally interacting daily with their infants was 37.7 seconds. The highest amount of time spent by a father in verbal interaction was 10 minutes, 26 seconds daily. Furthermore, the amount of verbal interaction in which the fathers engaged actually decreased over time. While this study was limited in terms of the small number of subjects and its reliance on verbal interaction only, it points to the very low amount of involvement that fathers in our culture tend to have with their young infants.

When men do interact with infants, they tend to do so in play rather than in actual caregiving. In a study of middle-class fathers of 8- or 9½-month old first-born babies, Pedersen and Robson (1969) found that 10% of the fathers did no caregiving whatsoever, while only 12% did two or more caregiving activities a day. On the other hand, fathers played with the infants an average of 8 hours per week. Thus, fathers' involvement with infants is much more likely to involve entertainment

and stimulation than direct physical care.

Men's degree of participation in household tasks, the other major component of family work, appears to be limited also. Tavis (1973), in a survey of a large number of readers of Psychology Today, found that while 73% of the men in the sample approved of equality in housework and child care, only 15% of them actually shared in these activities. This indicates that there is a large gap between men's attitudes about how much they should be involved in family work and their behavior in this regard. Berger and Wright (1978) pointed out that even in dual-employment families, which now predominate in the United States, housework is still primarily the woman's responsibility.

This low level of husband participation in family work apparently extends to other cultures as well. Haavio-Mannila (1975) found that in the U.S.S.R., Sweden, and Finland, women usually buy and prepare food, wash dishes and clothes, clean house, wash windows, and feed the children. Men, in contrast, usually fix things around the house, but they perform very few of the routine household tasks.

Some observers believe that this situation is changing, especially in industrialized countries, and that women are spending less time on household tasks while men are spending more such time. The data are unclear in this regard. Tavis and Offir (1977) cited a study of time use in 12 countries, which found that housewives today spend as much time as those of previous generations on housework, and those in developed countries spend as much time as those in underdeveloped countries. Furthermore, working wives get little help from their husbands; they

have 10 fewer hours of free time per week than housewives or employed men. In fact, "Working wives use weekends to catch up on the cleaning and shopping. Working husbands use weekends to do odd chores, and then catch up on their rest, watch TV or play sports" (Tavris & Offir, 1977, p. 231). With larger families, husbands' participation in family work decreases, partly because women do not want them more involved, as this intrudes on their domain. Tavris and Offir (1977) concluded somewhat pessimistically:

In countries that lack a widespread system of daycare and a belief in the benefits of communal child-rearing, women may find that having two jobs, home and career, is one too many. And while we can predict with confidence that increasing numbers of women will take their place alongside men in the working world, we have less confidence that increasing numbers of men will take their place alongside women in the nursery and the kitchen. No country has given the question top priority. Until it does, the hand that rocks the cradle will be too tired to rule the world. (p. 295)

Other data point to more optimistic conclusions regarding future male involvement in family work. Pleck (1979) cited the results of a survey of 1575 employed married persons, which found, by self-report, that husbands spend about half as much time (14.5 hours per week) as wives on housework, and about two-thirds as much time (20 hours per week) as wives on child care. Of greater significance, according to Pleck, was the finding (by self-report) that husbands with employed wives spend 1.8 more hours per week in housework (a nearly significant difference) and 2.7 more hours per week in child care (a significant difference) than husbands with nonemployed wives. Pleck contended that these results show that men are changing their roles in the family to a meaningful degree, albeit slowly and in small increments.

While the data are inconclusive in regard to men's changing their degree of participation in family work, it is clear that husbands in this society, as well as in many others, have, until recently, participated very little in housework and child care. Furthermore, it appears that while changes may be occurring, men's overall involvement in these areas is still low, especially when compared to the amount of time women spend performing housework and child care.

Male Involvement with Offspring in other Species and Cultures

Many people believe that the low degree of father involvement in child care noted above is universal in the animal kingdom and in human societies. The evidence, however, does not support this assumption. Rypma (1976) pointed out several examples of significant involvement with the young on the part of male animals: The male stickleback fish builds and defends the nest, and keeps the brood together after hatching; the male pigeon and herring gull incubate eggs from morning to afternoon; the male phalarope does all of the incubating of eggs; male wolves predigest and regurgitate food for the young; male lemurs crowd around infants after birth, grooming and cuddling them; male titi monkeys almost always carry infants when the latter are not engaged in nursing; and male Japanese macaques, especially during the natal season, care for older infants.

Redican (1976), reviewing male-infant interactions in nonhuman primates, pointed out that two types of New World monkeys, the marmoset and the tamarin, show a great deal of paternal involvement: The male marmoset, for example, sometimes helps with the birth, and he carries

the infant for the first 2 to 3 months except when it is nursing. Redican found a strong association between a monogamous social organization and a high degree of paternal caretaking, suggesting that a high degree of paternal care in humans would be consistent with what occurs in the rest of the animal world.

These studies of male animals' involvement with the young appear to belie the notion that exclusive or nearly exclusive maternal care of offspring is "natural," while paternal care of offspring is not. Among humans, also, primary care of the young by females is not universal. Nash (1976) cited an example of a culture in which the father plays the primary role in the care of young children: Among the Manus of New Guinea, from the time the infant is 1-year old, child care, including feeding, bathing, playing, and putting to sleep, is the father's responsibility. West and Konner (1976) found that the !Kung San (Bushmen) are considerably more nurturant toward children than American or British fathers. These authors described the cultural conditions that tend to be associated with greater male investment in the young in pre-industrial societies: lack of polygyny, lack of local warfare, and a significant contribution by women to the local economy. When men can earn more than women, or where there is a great deal of competition (as in American society), men do not contribute a great deal to child care. This analysis suggests that if women's economic status is made more equal to men's, fathers' involvement with young children will increase.

In summary, it appears that the low degree of husband participation in family work, especially child care, discussed in the previous

section, reflects neither a universal condition in the animal kingdom nor a universal norm among human cultures. In fact, given different cultural conditions, such as a reduction in competition among men and greater participation in the economy for women, the degree of husband participation in child care is likely to increase significantly.

Attitudes about Sex Roles

It seems that there have been considerable changes in the attitudes of men and women toward sex roles and changes in these roles. A close examination of the literature, however, reveals that this shift is really quite slow, especially among men, but also among women and even among female social scientists, who could reasonably be expected to be at the forefront of such attitudinal change.

Men's attitudes toward changing roles, especially in the home, appear still to follow traditional lines. Komarovsky's (1973) in-depth study of 62 male Ivy League college seniors revealed that most of these men expected their future wives to work, interrupt their careers for child care, then work again. The men said they would "help" with household tasks, but they excluded certain activities, such as changing diapers and doing laundry. They felt that there was no substitute for a mother in the care of young children. Consistent with these attitudes, Russell (1979) found that fathers are more likely than mothers to believe in a maternal instinct. Fathers, especially in traditional families, are also less likely than mothers to say that fathers can care for children. Thus, the attitudes of men, even those who are well educated, continue to support the arrangement of female domination of child care.

Women, too, appear to be changing their attitudes toward sex roles less quickly than many observers believe. Komarovsky (1979) pointed out that women, while clamoring for equality in the outside world, are not as vocal about it for the private world. In fact, most women still expect, for example, to withdraw from work for child rearing.

These attitudes continue to affect men's and women's role behavior in a variety of situations. In an "urban village" where cooperative child care, to be shared by both sexes, was set up, Harlow (1975) noted that the men often arrived late for or cancelled their scheduled participation in child care, while the women had difficulty really allowing the men to participate--they were constantly surprised that men could take care of children. Even dual-career families are not, for the most part, places where roles are truly shared. Women in such marriages tend to subordinate their own wishes for the sake of child rearing and supporting their husbands' careers. These modern couples are quite supportive of the woman's sharing the male work role, as long as this does not interfere with her role as mother; the man is not expected to reciprocate by sharing the female child-care role (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1973).

This difference in attitudes toward men's and women's changing roles appears to extend to other Western cultures. Haavio-Mannila (1975), in a study of attitudes in Finland, found that "attitudes of both sexes toward change in the women's traditional role are more favorable than the attitudes of men toward a change in their own role" (p. 82). Indeed,

while women's public role is changing in Finland, these changes have had little impact on roles within the home.

Social science research, even by female social scientists, appears to mirror the attitudes of the general population. Until recently, research on fathers has been scarce (Parke & O'Leary, 1976), possibly because fathers were considered of secondary importance. LeMasters (1970) pointed out that many major research studies on "parents" actually included only mothers. Literature on marital adjustment has taken as an assumption men's having an instrumental role and women's having an expressive role in marriage (Laws, 1971). Maccoby (1979), a female researcher, when suggesting alternatives for women who do not wish to engage in full-time child care, did not mention greatly increased father involvement as an option. Thus, even when female social scientists study alternatives to traditional sex-role behaviors, these alternatives do not often include significant changes in men's roles in domestic life.

When men do wish significantly to change their role behavior in domestic life, for example in regard to child care, they are likely to face great pressures from the rest of society not to do so. They are likely to be judged negatively, and to be pressured to "act like a man" (Berger & Wright, 1978). Even psychotherapists, who by now are mostly aware of women's needs to find fulfillment outside of the home, are largely unaware of and unsympathetic to men's needs to change their sex-role patterns also. The business world is likely to be even less supportive of male role changes: In a simulation experiment, Berger and Wright (1978) found that executives were less likely to approve a 1-month

parental leave for a man than for a woman, and they were more likely to think that a man applying for such a leave was not suited for their organization. Thus, there appears to be a general disapproval of men's wanting to be very involved in the care of their infants and young children.

The attitudes described above form the basic cultural context in which the present generation of parents was reared and continues to live. This set of attitudes does not appear to be conducive to shared caregiving of young children in married couples, nor do most couples engage in such sharing. One of the goals of the present study is to explore the attitudes toward sex roles and sex-role change of the few men who do share child care to an extensive degree.

Sex-Role Socialization of Children

The attitudes toward sex roles discussed above also manifest themselves in the different ways in which parents socialize their male and female children. Block (1978) pointed out that boys are encouraged in achievement and competition, control of affective expression, independence, personal responsibility, and conformity to external standards. Girls, on the other hand, are encouraged to express warmth and to be physically close to parents, and to wonder and think about life.

Adults tend to discourage or not to acknowledge nurturant and other "feminine" behaviors even in very young male infants. Seavey, Katz, and Zalk (1975) found that both male and female graduate students used a doll more in playing with a baby labeled female than with a baby labeled male. College students also label the behavior of infants

differently according to their gender. When shown a videotape of a baby labeled male or female reacting ambiguously to a jack-in-the-box, students were more likely to label the "boy's" reaction as anger or pleasure, and the "girl's" reaction as fear (Condry & Condry, 1976).

At least until very recently, if not now, boys and girls have experienced many differences, such as those just cited, in the way they have been socialized. These differences appear to have a significant bearing on the sex-role behavior in which they engage as adults. The present research investigated some of the sex-role socialization practices experienced by the shared-caregiving fathers under study, in an attempt to discover deviations from the experiences of other fathers.

Attachment and Responsiveness Between Men and Infants

Attachment has been defined as "an affectional tie that one person forms to another specific person, binding them together in space and enduring over time" (Ainsworth, 1973, p. 1). The development of attachment is considered essential to healthy psychological functioning in infants. However, as Ainsworth (1973) suggests, it may not be essential for mother and child to form an exclusive attachment relationship. Indeed, recent evidence suggests that strong reciprocal attachments between father and child, even in traditional, mother-dominated child-rearing situations, form early in the infant's life.

The attachment of infants to fathers has recently come under extensive study, and researchers have found that infants do, indeed, have the capacity to be strongly attached to their fathers, perhaps as strongly as to their mothers. Cohen and Campos (1974) studied the reactions of 10-, 13-, and 16-month old babies to situations involving the presence

of mother, father, and strangers. Over all the measures and at all ages, the infants showed the most attachment to mother, and the least attachment to strangers. However, they touched and went toward father more often than toward strangers, and they derived comfort near father but not near strangers. A few of the infants showed greater attachment to father than to mother. Ross, Kagan, Zelazo, and Kotelchuck (1975), in a similar study, found no differences in amount of play, amount of crying, and nearness to the exit when infants were left alone with mother or father, indicating a similar level of comfort in the presence of each.

Both Feldham and Ingham (1975) and Lamb (1977b) studied attachment behavior toward mother and father in infants exposed to varying degrees of stress. The children in the first study were 1- and 2½-years old; in the second, they were studied from the age of 9 months to 13 months. There were no differences in attachment behavior toward mother and father under moderate stress at any of the ages studied.

In another study, Lamb (1977a) found that, in the second year of life, boys are more attached to their fathers, and girls are more attached to their mothers. Another study, using naturalistic observations in a longitudinal fashion with children at the ages of 15, 20, and 30 months, found that the children were equally attached to their mothers and fathers (Clarke-Stewart, 1978).

The growing body of research on infant attachment to parents thus seems to indicate that infants become attached to their fathers very early in life to about the same degree as they do to their mothers.

This finding implies that significant father involvement with infants would not be a hindrance to the formation of attachment.

The idea that fathers can or should be very involved in the rearing of their infants and young children has not been a very popular one, and not until recently has it received serious attention from the social sciences. The idea that men have the same underlying capacity to nurture children as women is not new, however: Josselyn (1956) wrote:

Tenderness, gentleness, a capacity to respond emotionally and to rationalize at leisure, to value a love object more than the self, and to find a living experience in the experience of others is not the prerogative of women alone; it is a human characteristic.... Those capacities, in the man, are the constituent parts of fatherliness, just as they are, in women, motherliness. (p. 268)

Social science researchers have recently turned their attention to the underlying responsiveness of men to infants described by Josselyn and previously thought to be the province of women alone. These studies of men's attachment and responsiveness to infants complement those of infants' attachment to fathers discussed above, and they indicate that men do, indeed, have the underlying capacities necessary for the effective nurturance of infants and young children.

One hallmark study in regard to fathers' responsiveness to infants was that of Greenberg and Morris (1974), who discovered that fathers become "engrossed" with their newborns. These authors studied 30 first-time fathers of healthy, newborn infants. Half of the fathers attended their baby's birth, and half were shown the baby for the first time by the hospital nursing staff. The fathers were interviewed 48 to 72 hours after their babies were born. All of the fathers underwent a powerful emotional reaction to their baby's birth, which the researchers

labeled engrossment. This phenomenon was characterized by the following: (a) a perception of the infant as beautiful; (b) a strong desire to touch and hold the infant, which, when done, was experienced as pleasurable; (c) an awareness of the baby's distinct features; (d) a perception of the newborn as perfect; (e) a strong attraction to the infant, often described as "like a magnet," resulting in a focusing of attention on the infant; (f) a strong feeling of elation; and (g) feelings of increased self-esteem. The researchers implied that most fathers are capable of this strong emotional reaction to their newborn infants, and that engrossment may be an important factor in a father's becoming attached to his baby.

Klaus and Kennell (1976) studied the same phenomenon in fathers attending the home births of their infants. They also found an intense, ecstatic response on the part of the fathers. Brazelton, commenting on the study, quoted Margaret Mead:

No developing society that needs men to leave home and do his "thing" for the society ever allows young men in to handle or touch their newborns. There's always a taboo against it. For they know somewhere that, if they did, the new fathers would become so "hooked" that they would never get out and do their "thing" properly. (Klaus & Kennell, 1976, p. 44)

Mead's statement suggests that societies throughout the world know of men's potential for engrossment with and strong attachment to infants, and guard against it so that men will achieve more in the world outside the home.

Other researchers have focused on the actual behavior of fathers with their young infants, rather than on their emotional reactions.

Parke and O'Leary (1976) found that a group of fathers who had, for the

most part, attended childbirth classes and had been present at their infants' delivery interacted with their newborns in much the same fashion as their wives. The interactive behaviors that were observed were: hold infant in arms, hand infant to other parent, change position of infant, look at, vocalize to, smile at, rock, touch, explore, kiss, imitate, and feed infant. The only difference between mothers and fathers was that mothers smiled at the infants more.

In a second study, Parke and O'Leary (1976) found basically the same behavior in a group of lower-class fathers, none of whom had attended childbirth classes or been present at the delivery. When the mother-infant alone interaction was compared to the father-infant alone interaction, using the same behaviors as above, the only difference found was that mothers fed the infants more (all infants were bottle-fed). In a separate study, Sawin and Parke (1976) observed that male adolescents were just as successful at bottle-feeding their infants as female adolescents. It appears that even quite unprepared fathers, given the opportunity, interact with their newborns as competently as mothers.

The studies reviewed so far have indicated that men are very emotionally and behaviorally responsive to their newborn infants. Many people believe, however, that women have a physiological response to infants which is not shared by men and which makes them more suitable for caring for infants. Recent research on physiological responsiveness does not support this belief.

Frodi and Lamb (1978) studied the physiological reactions of

8- and 14-year old boys and girls to videotapes of babies. Boys and girls became equally physiologically aroused (in terms of blood pressure, heart beat, and skin conductance) when they viewed a videotape of a crying baby, while neither reacted to a smiling baby. This was true regardless of the amount of experience the subjects had had with babies, leading the researchers to suggest that this physiological response may be species-specific without regard to gender.

Similar findings have been made regarding physiological responsiveness to infants in adults. Frodi, Lamb, Leavitt, Donovan, Neff, and Sherry (1978) found no differences in physiological arousal in mothers and fathers in response to a videotape of a young infant crying. Frodi (1980), in a review of her own series of experiments, pointed out that fathers' and mothers' physiological responses to a videotape of a baby were identical. Frodi concluded that men appear to have the underlying physiological capacity to interact effectively with infants, but that they have been socialized not to behave in line with this potential responsiveness.

If men can, indeed, respond emotionally, behaviorally, and physiologically to infants, to the same degree as women, then why do they not manifest these capacities more in their behavior? The answer appears to be, at least in part, what Frodi alluded to: the different roles for which they have been socialized. This notion is supported by other research.

Feldman and Nash (1978) studied interest in infants in 120 young adult men and women, including cohabiting couples, married but

childless couples, couples expecting a baby, and parents of an infant. Overall, the women were more interested in babies than the men; but when the data were analyzed within each group, only the female parents, who carried the primary responsibility for child care, showed more interest than their male counterparts. In other words, men showed less interest in infants only when their sex role (secondary caregiver) called for less interest--their level of interest was linked to their life situation.

On the other hand, men who are in a role with their infants similar to the role of most mothers tend to respond to their infants as effectively as and similarly to mothers. Field (1978) studied three groups of parents interacting with their 4-month old infants: mothers, primary caregiver fathers, and secondary caregiver fathers. The primary caregiver fathers were much more similar to mothers in their behavior toward their infants than to secondary caregiver fathers. The fathers' roles in the lives of their infants were stronger predictors of their behavior with their infants than their gender.

If different role demands were placed on men, could they successfully put their potential into practice, and rear infants? Direct experimental research on this question is impossible; research directly relevant to it has only been done using rhesus monkeys. Mitchell, Redican, and Gomber (1974) have successfully paired adult rhesus monkeys, who usually react with indifference or hostility to infants in the wild, with infants in their cages. After an initial period of adjustment, the males have successfully reared the infants. While one cannot

necessarily draw conclusions about human behavior from research with animals, this study implies that men could, indeed, successfully rear infants if called upon to do so.

In summary, it has previously been thought that infants and mothers are "naturally" attached to each other, and that this process included men peripherally at the most. The research suggests, however, that (a) even young infants may become as attached or almost as attached to their fathers as to their mothers; (b) men respond very emotionally to their newborn infants; (c) men interact with their newborn infants virtually identically to the manner in which women do; (d) males respond to infants physiologically in the same manner as females; and (e) it is men's roles with infants that determine whether or not they will act on their potential for emotional, behavioral, and physiological responsiveness to infants.

Antecedents of Shared Caregiving in Fathers

While it is difficult to guess what proportion of fathers purposefully arrange their lives so as to participate in the care of their infants or young children as fully as their wives, there is little doubt that it is a very small, although growing, number (Russell, 1979). Since these men are so unusual, and because they grew up in a cultural milieu that did not promote the lifestyle they have chosen as adults, the question of what factors in their development contributed to this choice is an important one--whether one wishes simply to understand, or to promote, the phenomenon of shared caregiving between husbands and wives. Some of the likely factors appear to be sex-role orientation,

attitudes about sex roles, attitudes and behaviors of wives and parents, and conscious and unconscious motives. It is some of these potential antecedents of shared caregiving that the hypotheses of the present study address.

Androgyny is a concept that has gained wide attention in recent years, since Bem (1974; Note 1) introduced it to the psychological literature. Defined by Webster's (1971) as "having the characteristics of both sexes; being at once both male and female," measures of androgyny have been found to be associated with other psychological characteristics and behaviors. Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) found that androgynous subjects had higher self-esteem than masculine or feminine subjects. Androgynous subjects have also been found to be more flexible in the manifestations of both masculine and feminine behavior, depending upon the particular situation in which they find themselves (Bem, 1975; Bem & Lenney, 1976; Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976). In short, androgyny appears to be a correlate, and possibly an antecedent, of flexible sex-role behavior in both men and women.

Based on this and other literature, Russell (in press) hypothesized that fathers who shared child care at least equally with their wives would be more androgynous than traditional fathers. Using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) as the measure of sex-role orientation, Russell found that such fathers had significantly higher scores on the femininity scale of the BSRI than traditional fathers. Furthermore, classifying the subjects into sex-role orientation groups, Russell found that, compared to traditional fathers, significantly more of the fathers

who shared child care were androgynous.

Radin's (Note 2) study of child-rearing fathers in intact families partially supported Russell's findings. Radin found that fathers who were sharing child care about equally with their wives had higher femininity scores than traditional fathers, but fathers who were performing well over half of the child-rearing functions had femininity scores that did not differ from those of traditional fathers. Despite the seeming discrepancy manifested in this latter finding, the research of Russell (in press) and Radin (Note 2) extended the laboratory-based findings on flexible sex-role behavior cited above: It strongly suggests that an androgynous sex-role orientation, especially a more feminine orientation than that of most men, is correlated with, and possibly antecedent to, the role of sharing child-care responsibility for men. These findings form the basis for the first hypothesis of the present study, which was designed to clarify the findings of these two researchers: Men who, by choice, share child care or have primary responsibility for child care within an intact family are more androgynous than men who are not performing such a role.

Attitudes may also play a role in the decision to share child care. Russell (in press) found that fathers who shared child care were less likely than traditional fathers to believe that there is an exclusive maternal instinct, or a fundamental difference between males and females, that is responsible for the different roles of mothers and fathers. Furthermore, fathers who shared child care were also found to believe that fathers could be successful caregivers more than traditional

fathers. Thus, beliefs about sex roles and their causes appear to be another mediating factor in the decision by men to share child care.

While the sex-role orientation and beliefs of men appear to be significant in the choice of fathers to share caregiving with their wives, the sex-role orientations, attitudes, and behaviors of their wives also appear to be factors in the amount of child care performed by men.

Russell (1978) found wives' sex-role orientation a crucial factor in husbands' involvement in child care. Fathers who were low in femininity but married to women who were high in masculinity participated more in child care than fathers who were low in femininity but married to women who were low in masculinity.

Russell (1979) found that men whose wives worked full-time participated more in child care than men whose wives worked part-time or did not work. Sagi (in press) also found a strong association between a wife's working and a husband's being involved in child care. Even a wife's desire to work seems to be associated with more husband involvement in child care (Radin, in press). Furthermore, the wives of men who share child care appear to have more opportunity for employment than the wives of men who do not share child care; they have had educational experiences that better prepared them for work (Russell, in press). It seems, then, that wives have a significant influence on the degree of involvement in child care manifested by their husbands, particularly through their orientation toward the traditionally masculine world: If they (a) have a partially masculine sex-role orientation, (b) desire to work, (c) become educated so that there are more employment oppor-

tunities open to them, or (d) actually work full-time, their husbands are more likely to be involved in child care.

Radin (in press) uncovered one other indirect way in which wives may influence the amount of caregiving done by their husbands. She found that women whose husbands were more involved in caregiving had fathers who had been less involved in child care than the fathers of women whose husbands were less involved in caregiving. Furthermore, this low level of involvement on the part of the wives' fathers was perceived by the wives as nurturant and pleasurable, as something of which they had wanted more. In other words, these wives received very little of "a good thing" from their fathers, and they may have influenced their husbands to give their own children more of such nurturance.

The potential antecedents of shared caregiving that have been discussed so far have been factors in the adult lives of the fathers studied--their own attitudes and beliefs, and the attitudes and behavior of their wives. One would expect, according to social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), that there would be differences also in the backgrounds of shared-caregiving and traditional fathers. Studies in this regard have focused on the mothers and fathers of men with various sex-role orientations and with various degrees of involvement with their children.

Surprisingly, it appears that the personalities of men's mothers may have more to do with their involvement in child care than the personalities of their fathers. Heilbrun (1978) found that androgynous college men identified with an androgynous mother. Russell (Note 3) found that men whose mothers worked were more likely to participate in child care

than men whose mothers did not work. Other studies have confirmed this relationship between a mother's working and her son's being more involved in child care. DeFrain (1979), in a study of couples who shared child care, found that 25% of the mothers of the parents had worked outside the home while their children were of preschool age, while 50% of the mothers of the parents had worked outside the home before the children finished high school. Radin (in press), in a study of families in which the fathers did more of the child care than the mothers, found that, for 25% of the couples, both the husband's mother and the wife's mother had worked before either the husband or wife was 10 years old; none of the couples in the traditional group reported this.

Since working was considered a primarily masculine activity during the time when these couples were growing up, it is likely that the working mothers were more androgynous in their sex-role orientation than the nonworking mothers. This implies, then, that an androgynous sex-role orientation on the part of a man's mother may be a significant antecedent of shared caregiving. This speculation led to the second hypothesis of the present study: Fathers who share caregiving had mothers who were more androgynous, when the fathers were young children, than the mothers of fathers who do not share caregiving.

While the evidence just cited suggests a strong influence of mothers in the development of a shared-caregiving lifestyle in men, their fathers served as their models of fatherly behavior, leading one to speculate that the sex-role orientation and behavior of men's fathers should also be significant factors in the amount of child care engaged in by

men. Two hypotheses about the modeling influences of fathers have been advanced to account for their sons' deciding to share caregiving (Sagi, in press; Radin, Note 4). The compensatory hypothesis suggests that shared-caregiving fathers (whose behavior does not imitate that of their own fathers, who did not share caregiving) are compensating for having had a less nurturant, less involved, less dominant father; in other words, shared-caregiving fathers are "making up" for what they did not get from their own fathers when they were children. The modeling hypothesis, in contrast, suggests that shared-caregiving fathers are modeling themselves after their own nurturant fathers; they are simply extending the kind of fathering behavior that they experienced.

Radin (Note 4) found no confirmation of either of these hypotheses: In a study of 59 intact middle-class families in which couples had been in a role-reversal arrangement an average of 35 months, there was no correlation between the fathers' involvement in child care and the nurturance, availability, role in decision-making, or total involvement of their own fathers. A study of parents who were sharing child care relatively equally (neither parent having more than 60% of the child-care time) gave support to both the compensatory and the modeling hypotheses: Fathers explained their involvement in terms of both imitating and counter-imitating their own fathers (DeFraim, 1979). Sagi's (in press) study of suburban Israeli Jews found a definite trend toward high correlations between fathers' degree of involvement in child care and their own fathers' degree of involvement in child care. Sagi, noting the in-

conclusive previous evidence, suggested that shared-caregiving fathers may become involved in child care through either avenue: Compensation may occur when their fathers' involvement has been particularly low, while modeling may occur when it has been high. The present study explores this interesting speculation through inquiries about the quality of the fathers' interactions with their own fathers, but no hypothesis was advanced in this regard.

The antecedents of shared caregiving discussed so far deal primarily with conscious attitudes and beliefs of fathers, as well as the possible influences of the personalities of their wives and parents. Internal motivations, however, of either a conscious or unconscious nature, are another aspect of personality that play an important part in determining behavior. A social motive can be defined as a "recurrent goal state, usually detectable in fantasy, which demonstrably energizes, directs, and selects behavior" (McClelland, 1971, p. 19). Two motives that would seem to play a part, perhaps unconsciously, in the decision of whether or not to share child care, are intimacy and power, both of which have been studied by means of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), an instrument commonly used to detect conscious or unconscious motivation through fantasy story productions.

Using the TAT, McAdams (1980) developed a method for scoring intimacy motivation. He then correlated scores on this measure with various other measures of personality and behavior. McAdams (in press), summarizing the findings of his previous research, pointed out that college students who score high on intimacy motivation are consistently perceived

by their peers as more sincere and warm, and less dominant, in interpersonal relationships than students who score low on intimacy motivation. In addition, McAdams and Powers (1981) showed that the intimacy motive is related to intimate behavior. Using behavior manifested in a short, nontherapeutic psychodrama scenario as a measure of spontaneous interpersonal behavior, these researchers found that the scenarios of subjects scoring high in intimacy motivation were characterized by "positive affect, reciprocal dialogue, and surrender of control" (McAdams & Powers, 1981, p. 585). Thus, subjects scoring high in intimacy motivation have been shown to be rated by peers as higher in traits associated with interpersonal intimacy and to behave in more intimate ways in an unstructured, supportive interpersonal situation, than subjects scoring low in intimacy motivation.

Fathers who choose to perform child care a significant amount of time, rather than taking on the traditional, assertive male role of full-time breadwinner, are placing themselves in a position that is favorable to the development of intimate relationships. This role calls for less active doing, and more being, than the role of full-time wage earner; sensitivity and availability are more important than active assertion. These qualities are characteristic of the goals of intimacy motivation, which involves "a recurrent preference or readiness for interpersonal experiences of close, warm, and communicative exchange" (McAdams, in press, p. 34) and an emphasis on "being over doing" (McAdams, in press, p. 31). Based on this observation and on the correlates of intimacy motivation uncovered so far, the present study hypothesizes that fathers

who share caregiving are higher in intimacy motivation than fathers who do not do so.

The power motive is another personality characteristic that may be associated with the choice of whether or not to be a shared-caregiving father. In contrast to the intimacy motive, the power motive represents "the quest for power, the desire for power, or the seeking of power" (Winter & Stewart, 1978, p. 393). Winter (1973) developed a scoring system for power motivation using the TAT, similar to the one developed by McAdams (1980) with intimacy motivation. Winter has correlated this motive with other aspects of personality and behavior. Winter and Stewart (1978), summarizing previous research of theirs, found that, for middle-class and upper-middle class adult males, power motivation predicts careers that involve the use of direct and legitimate power in interpersonal situations. Winter and Stewart (1978) concluded that "the power motive predicts seeking and getting formal institutionalized social power" (p. 402).

While adults who rear children certainly have power over children's behavior, society does not consider the position of child rearer a powerful one. It does not involve any power over one's peers, for example, nor does it require special attributes of the individual: Any adult has power over the behavior of small children. Finally, the power of the child rearer is not formal, institutionalized power; it is, rather, due to the discrepancies in physical, intellectual, and emotional maturity between adults and children, a natural given. Thus, the experience of power in raising children appears to be different enough from the experience of social power in a career, or in other interpersonal situations, that it is probably mediated by a social motive different from the

power motive.

Winter (1973) found further that subjects high in power motivation tend to have more prestigious possessions, compared to subjects low in power motivation. Subjects high in power motivation appear to be concerned with gaining prestige. Fathers who do a significant amount of child care are engaged in an activity that does not bring prestige from most of society. Therefore, they are likely to be motivated by goals having little to do with power.

It has been shown that institutionalized social power and prestige are significant correlates of power motivation in adult males. It has been argued that the performance of a significant amount of child care on the part of adult males provides neither institutionalized social power nor prestige. Therefore, it is reasonable to predict that men who spend a great deal of time caring for their young children are lower in power motivation than men who do not undertake such a role; this prediction constitutes the fourth hypothesis of the present study.

In summary, it appears that the choice of becoming a shared-care-giving father is multiply determined. Some of the probable antecedents of this role include sex-role orientations and beliefs of fathers themselves, sex-role orientations and behaviors of wives, sex-role orientations and behaviors of parents, and underlying motivations of fathers. These antecedents are examined in the present study.

Effects of Father Involvement on Children's Development

If fathers do act on their potential for effective involvement with their infants and young children to the point of being significantly involved in their rearing, what will be the consequences for children?

There is little research available on this question, but the existing evidence suggests positive effects for children.

Lamb (1978) found that infants whose fathers were caretakers showed more distress when their fathers left a room than infants whose fathers were not caretakers, indicating a greater degree of attachment. Similarly, Pedersen and Robson (1969) found a significant correlation between the amount of caretaking and involvement on the father's part and the level of attachment to father in male infants. Kotelchuck (1976) pointed out that infants with actively involved fathers enjoy being left alone with a stranger more than infants with less involved fathers, indicating less fear of other people.

Father involvement with infants may have positive intellectual effects as well. Spelke, Zelazo, Kagan, and Kotelchuck (1973) found that 1-year old babies with high-interaction fathers paid more attention to a stimulus with discrepant features than babies with low-interaction fathers. Radin (1973) found that 4-year old boys' IQs were significantly correlated, concurrently and at a 1-year follow-up, with paternal nurturance manifested during a 1-hour interview.

A few studies have attempted to assess directly the effects on children of the kind of shared-caregiving arrangement that is the subject of the present research. First, there appear to be no particular negative effects on children of being in a family where child care is shared by the husband and wife (Russell, in press). Furthermore, it appears that high father involvement is associated with greater internality (Radin, Note 4) and more internal locus of control in preschool children (Sagi, in press; Radin, Note 4). High father involvement is also significantly

correlated with empathy in children between the ages of 3 and 6 years (Sagi, in press). Sagi (in press) also found that high-involvement fathers encouraged more independence and achievement in their children than low-involvement fathers. Daughters of shared-caregiving fathers seem to develop a masculine sex-role orientation as well as the traditional feminine orientation (Sagi, in press).

While the studies cited thus far are correlational in nature, other researchers have manipulated father interaction with infants and measured the effects. Zelazo, Kotelchuck, Barber, and David (1977) gave a list of games and a variety of play materials to a group of fathers who were low in involvement with and sensitivity to their 12-month old male infants. After a 4-week period of using the games, the infants of these fathers showed a greater increase in father-directed interactions than the control group. In other words, only 1 month of increased father interaction produced more positive attachment behavior in infants.

Approaching the subject of the effects of male involvement from a different angle, Pannabecker and Emde (1977) measured the effects of increased involvement with their newborns on later nurturant behavior in a group of middle-class fathers. One group within their sample was given a session in which they were taught about their babies' physical characteristics and about how to hold the babies and do exercises with them. One control group was given a similar session, but using a videotape of a strange baby. The second control group had no contact with the investigators prior to the observation of the dependent variable, which was the amount of nurturant behavior expressed toward the baby during a pediatric check-up when the babies were 1-month old. Only minor differences

were observed in this behavior in the three groups, leading the authors to point out that the entire sample consisted of middle-class fathers who were quite involved with their infants anyway, minimizing the impact of the experimental manipulation.

Lind (Note 5), on the other hand, found that Swedish fathers who had been taught child-care skills in the maternity ward took part more in child-care and household tasks than other fathers when their babies were 3 months old. Thus, programs that teach fathers about their infants may result in an increase in fathers' interactions with their infants. This increased interaction seems to have a positive effect on children's social, emotional, and intellectual development. The evidence strongly suggests that shared responsibility for infant care by parents would have important benefits for the children.

Summary and Hypotheses

The literature reviewed above provides the background for the present study. It has been shown that fathers in American society generally spend little time engaged in housework and child care; it has been shown further that these low levels of involvement in domestic life are not universal among other animal species or among other human cultures. The shared-caregiving fathers studied here are an example of a deviation from this norm.

The attitudes toward sex roles that form the basic cultural milieu in which shared-caregiving fathers function have been discussed, and they have been shown not to encourage the type of lifestyle that these fathers lead. It has been shown that fathers and infants do become attached to each other, but that most men do not act fully upon their

underlying emotional, behavioral, and physiological responsiveness to infants. The shared-caregiving fathers in the present study, in contrast to most men, are leading lifestyles that reflect this responsiveness. The available evidence, discussed above, indicates that such a lifestyle may be beneficial for children's emotional and cognitive development.

Finally, literature regarding possible antecedents of a shared-caregiving lifestyle for fathers has been discussed, including men's sex-role orientations, their wives' and parents' sex-role orientations, their parents' behavioral modeling, and their conscious and unconscious motivations. Based on this discussion, the following hypotheses have been formulated for testing in the present study:

1. Shared-caregiving fathers are more psychologically androgynous than traditional fathers.
2. Shared-caregiving fathers are more likely to have had an androgynous mother than traditional fathers.
3. Shared-caregiving fathers are higher in intimacy motivation than traditional fathers.
4. Shared-caregiving fathers are lower in power motivation than traditional fathers.

In addition, it is expected that shared-caregiving fathers will have had backgrounds and experiences that predisposed them to becoming significantly involved as caretakers for their young children. Therefore, in addition to testing these hypotheses, this study explored other facets of the attitudes, personalities, demographic characteristics, lifestyles, recent experiences, and early experiences of shared-caregiving fathers.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects consisted of a group of 15 shared-caregiving fathers and 15 other fathers who served as a control group. A shared-caregiving father was defined (in a fashion similar to the definition of Russell, in press) as being, by choice, significantly involved in the care of his child or children under the age of 5 years to the extent that he had sole responsibility for the care of this child or children for at least 15 hours per week. (The purpose of the "by choice" stipulation was to eliminate fathers who were in a shared-caregiving situation out of necessity, such as physical disability or unemployment.) A control-group father was defined as having sole responsibility for the care of his child or children under the age of 5 years for less than 15 hours per week. In addition, both groups of subjects met the following criteria: They were married to and living with the mother of their child or children under the age of 5--that is, all were members of intact families. The only exception to these criteria was one shared-caregiving father, whose child was 5 years, 4 months old at the time of the study. One shared-caregiving father and one control father each had an adopted child under the age of 5. Three other control fathers each had two older stepchildren, but their children under 5 years old were their natural children. All the other fathers had only natural children.

The shared-caregiving group was found through the author's personal contacts, through the mailing list of a publication concerned with men and child care, and through the recommendations of subjects obtained through these avenues. These subjects were contacted by telephone or letter, and, after it was determined that they met the above criteria, they were asked to participate in a study of fathers who were sharing child care with their wives. The control group was obtained through contacting the directors of several university-based preschools; permission was obtained to send a letter to the fathers of each school's children, either via the children or through the mail. These fathers were solicited for a study of fathers; the letter emphasized that fathers are important, that research on fathers is scarce, and that their participation would be very useful in furthering psychological knowledge of male parents. A form, indicating their willingness to participate and attesting to their meeting the criteria, was enclosed; the fathers were asked to return it to the investigator, either through the mail or through their child, who could leave it at the preschool office.

It should be noted that the control group, surprisingly, was much more difficult to obtain than the shared-caregiving group; very few fathers (less than 5%) from each preschool agreed to participate. This fact could be very significant for the outcome of the study: Subjects were asked to give several hours of their time without compensation, and it seems likely that the control-group fathers who agreed to participate were a self-selected group who were very invested in their roles as fathers and who believed that research on fathers was important enough for them to give their valuable time.

The mean age of the shared-caregiving fathers was 33.1 years, while that of the control group was 36.1 years, a difference that approached significance, $t(28) = 1.99$, $p < .06$. The mean socioeconomic index scores for both groups' families, using Hollingshead's (Note 6) method in which one or two breadwinners are included, depending on the family, placed them both in the highest socioeconomic category (major business and professional). The two groups also did not differ in the socioeconomic class of their families of origin: On the average, both were from the second highest class (medium business, minor professional, or technical), with an approximately even distribution in each group from among the top three socioeconomic categories. In summary, the subjects of both groups came predominantly from the middle class, and they themselves had reached the highest social-class status level as measured by a commonly used index.

The mean number of children in each group was as follows: shared-caregiving, 1.5; control, 2.1. This difference, however, was due in large measure to the differences in the fathers' ages: An analysis of covariance with age as the covariate showed age to be significant, $F(1, 27) = 7.0$, $p < .02$, while number of children alone was not significant. The mean ages of the children were 3.7 years for the shared-caregiving group and 6.7 years for the control group, which, again, can be attributed to the control group's being older.

The groups were similar in their ethnic backgrounds and current religions. All the fathers were native-born white Americans, with the exception of one control-group father, who was English. The demographic data for the two groups, including self-descriptions of ethnic background

and current religious affiliation, are summarized in Table 1.

Measures

The Personal Data form, devised by the author, asked for identifying data on the subjects themselves (age, occupation, number and ages of children, etc.), as well as a small amount of information about their wives and parents (e.g., occupation, education). This form is reproduced in Appendix A.

The Texas Social Behavior Inventory, Form A (TSBI; Helmreich & Stapp, 1974) is an objective measure of self-esteem; it assesses the individual's self-confidence and competence in social situations. Subjects rate themselves on a 5-point scale, ranging from "not at all characteristic of me" to "very much characteristic of me," for 16 statements. Each item is scored from 0 to 4, with 0 representing a response indicating lower self-esteem and 4 representing a response indicating higher self-esteem. Each subject's score is obtained by dividing his total score by 16. This measure was used in an exploratory fashion, to see if there was any relationship between shared caregiving and self-esteem.

The Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire (WFOQ; Helmreich & Spence, 1978) assesses several different aspects of achievement motivation, each of which forms a nonoverlapping scale of from four to eight of the 23 achievement items: Work (positive attitudes toward work); Mastery (the preference for difficult, challenging tasks); Competitiveness (the desire to succeed in competitive interpersonal situations); and Personal Unconcern (lack of concern about the possible negative interpersonal consequences of achievement). Subjects respond to the items on a 5-point scale ranging from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree." These items

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Characteristics	Group	
	Shared-Caregiving	Control
Age	33.1	36.1*
Socioeconomic Status	Group 1 ^a	Group 1
Number of Children	1.5	2.1
Religion ^b		
Catholic	2	4
Protestant	1	2
Jewish	2	1
Christian	2	0
Agnostic	2	1
None	5	6
Other	1	1
Ethnic Background ^b		
European	7	15
Caucasian		
American	5	0
Ukrainian	1	0
Jewish	1	0
Russian Jewish	1	0

Note. n = 15 in each group.

^aGroup 1 = Major business and professional (Hollingshead, Note 6).

^bCategories were named by the subjects. All subjects except one were native-born white Americans.

*t(28) = 1.99, p < .06.

are scored from 0 to 4, with 0 representing a response indicating low achievement motivation, and 4 representing a response indicating high achievement motivation. Scores on the items for each scale are summed to obtain the score for that scale; these scores are added to obtain the total WOFO score. There are nine supplemental items (not analyzed for the present study) which deal with educational aspirations, pay, prestige, advancement, attitudes toward spouse employment, relative importance of marriage vs. career, and number of children desired. To this author's knowledge, no previous research has been conducted using this instrument with fathers who have different degrees of involvement in child care. No hypotheses were generated regarding scores on this questionnaire, but it seemed reasonable to suspect that fathers who stay home with young children a significant portion of their time might have levels of various aspects of achievement motivation different from those of fathers who do not do so.

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973) originally consisted of 55 items dealing with attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. The authors of the scale now recommend the use of a 15-item version which has a very high correlation with the full scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Subjects respond on a 4-point scale, ranging from "Agree strongly" to "Disagree strongly." Each item is scored from 0 to 3, with 0 indicating a response that represents a traditional attitude toward women's rights and roles, and 3 indicating a response that represents a profeminist, egalitarian attitude. The subject's score is obtained by summing the item scores. The scale was included as an exploratory measure because, while previous

research has indicated that men's attitudes about sex roles may be more liberal than their behavior (Tavris, 1973), it was suspected that the shared-caregiving fathers might show a tendency toward more liberal attitudes than the other fathers.

The final measure in the subjects' packets, the Sex-Role Questionnaire (SRQ; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968), was selected because it contains a competence-assertion (male-valued or masculine) cluster and a warmth-expressiveness (female-valued or feminine) cluster, rather than treating these personality characteristics as bipolar opposites. The SRQ consists of 80 traits, with each trait and its opposite appearing at the ends of a 7-point scale. The subject is instructed to place a mark anywhere between the endpoints; there are nine dots between every pair of scale points. Items are scored from 1 to 7, with 7 representing either a high warmth-expressiveness or a high competence-assertion score. The subject's score for each cluster is obtained by summing the item scores in that cluster. The SRQ was used as an indicator of the relative strengths of masculine and feminine personality characteristics in the subjects and their parents, giving some indication of degree of androgyny.

The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) was used to measure the strength of the intimacy and power motives in the subjects; this use was based on the models for the use of the TAT to measure stable motivational characteristics of individuals presented by Atkinson (1958). The pictures, administered in the following order, were: (a) two figures sitting on a park bench; (b) a man sitting at a desk upon which sits a photograph of a family; (c) a ship's captain and a reporter; (d) a man and woman

on a trapeze; (e) two female scientists in a laboratory; and (f) a man, woman, and dog walking through a field with horses (McAdams, in press). Pictures (a) and (b) can be found in McClelland and Steele (1972). Pictures (c) through (f) can be found in McClelland (1975).

The last measure was an extensive structured interview devised by the author, the content of which was greatly influenced by the research of Russell (in press). The interview was divided into three main parts. Part I contained questions pertaining to the current lifestyles of the subjects, focusing on child-care arrangements and amount of involvement in child care and housework. Part II contained questions about experiences in adult life that might have influenced the subjects' choice of child-care arrangements, as well as about currently held attitudes about sex-role behavior for parents and children. Part III probed a wide range of early childhood experiences, particularly within the subjects' families, that were thought to relate to sex-role socialization. The main purpose of the interview was to explore possible antecedents of shared caregiving. The interview schedule is reproduced in Appendix B.

Procedure

After each subject had signed a form indicating his willingness to participate in the research and his meeting the criteria for participation, the author mailed him a packet of materials containing the following measures in this order: the Personal Data form, the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (Form A), the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire, the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (15-item version), and the Sex-Role Questionnaire. The latter was presented three times: The first time, the subjects were instructed to describe themselves; the next two times,

they were instructed to describe their fathers and mothers when they, the subjects, were children under the age of 12 years. The latter two sets of instructions were counterbalanced within each group of subjects. A large, self-addressed, stamped envelope was included for the subjects' convenience in returning the packets.

After each subject had returned his packet, the author telephoned him to arrange a personal interview and the administration of the TAT. (In the cases of two of the shared-caregiving subjects, the interview was conducted by long-distance telephone, and the TAT was not administered.) Each interview/TAT session, with the exception of the telephone interviews, was conducted at the subject's convenience as to time and place. Most occurred in the subjects' homes, but one took place in the author's home, and several of the control-group interviews took place in the subjects' offices at work. The subjects' wives were not in the rooms in which the interviews took place, but the children, especially of the shared-caregiving fathers, often were; interruptions were not uncommon. Most of the TAT/interview sessions took place at one sitting, but a few required a second appointment. All sessions were conducted by the author, except for that of one shared-caregiving father, a personal friend of the author's, whose session was conducted by the chairperson of the author's dissertation committee.

Each TAT/interview session consisted of the administration first of the six TAT cards, with standard instructions: Write an imaginative story with a past, present, and future; it helps to tell what the characters are thinking and feeling. The subjects were given a separate piece of paper for each story, and were told that they had 5 minutes to complete

each one; they were informed when 1 minute remained. While timing them, the investigator quietly read, or, if necessary, entertained the subjects' children.

At the completion of the TAT, each subject was asked to give his written consent to a partial audio-tape recording of the interview; all subjects consented. The interview was recorded beginning with Item 7 of Part II, because it was felt that at that point the responses became more subjective and ambiguous. The long-distance telephone interviews were not recorded.

Scoring and data analysis. The Texas Social Behavior Inventory (Form A), the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire, and the Attitudes toward Women Scale (15-item version) were scored in their standard manners. The Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire was scored to yield separate indices for each aspect of achievement motivation that it measures, as well as a total score. The Sex-Role Questionnaire was scored separately for self, mother, and father. Since the subjects had placed a mark anywhere on a continuum from 1 to 7, the number closest to the mark was the assigned score for each item. In cases where the mark was exactly between two numbers, the assigned score was, arbitrarily, always the number to the left of the mark.

The means for the two groups for all of these scores were compared using a t test. A Mann-Whitney U was also calculated as a check against extreme scores (these figures are not reported in the analysis, because in no case was the U significant while the t was not). In addition, because the two groups' ages were almost significantly different, an analysis of covariance with age as the covariate was performed on all the

measures, in order to check for the contribution of age, as well as group membership, to the difference in means on the dependent measures. The results of these analyses are reported only when age was found to be a significant contributor to the variance; otherwise, the results of the t tests are reported.

The TAT stories were scored for both power motivation and intimacy motivation, using the systems devised by Winter (1973) for power and McAdams (Note 7) for intimacy. The scorer, who was the author of the intimacy scoring system, was blind to the group membership of the subjects. The group means on these measures were analyzed in the same fashion as those of the other measures.

The interview was scored and analyzed in several different ways. First, any questions that were answered in terms of simple numbers (e.g., number of hours of sole caregiving per week; see Appendix B) were evaluated by comparing group means using the method outlined above. Second, the rest of the non-tape-recorded portion of the interview was analyzed in the following fashion: Taking five interview protocols from each group, the investigator closely examined the subjects' answers, and determined on which questions the two groups appeared to differ. All of the subjects' answers for those particular questions were then placed into conceptually meaningful categories, and differences between the groups were analyzed using χ^2 analyses. Only those questions with significant differences are reported; they included questions about the employment patterns and child-care arrangements of the subjects and their wives, the aspects of their child-care arrangements that the subjects liked and disliked, and the degree of participation by the subjects in the care of

their children in the first 3 months after they were born. No naive scorer was used for this section because the answers were fairly straightforward, and thus not readily subject to scorer bias.

The tape-recorded part of the interview was scored in a similar manner. Questions which appeared to differentiate a subsample of five subjects from each group were first identified by the investigator. Next, a scoring system was devised, using the actual answers of these 10 subjects as guides: The system provided for each answer to be assigned to one of two categories (see Appendix C). The investigator then used this system to score the interview answers of 1 of the 10 subjects, whose answers appeared to be ambiguous and difficult to score (the subject's tape recording was used for this scoring). The investigator then taught the scoring system to a scorer who was completely naive as to the purpose, hypotheses, or groups involved in the research. The method was taught by listening together to the tape recording of the subject mentioned above, and comparing and discussing scores assigned by each listener. After total agreement was reached for this subject, the tape recordings (or, if they were unavailable or difficult to hear, the written interview protocols) of the other nine subjects in the scoring-derivation group were scored independently by the investigator and the scorer. These scores were then compared for each question, and a reliability coefficient was calculated. The following coefficients were obtained for the 13 questions that were scored: 1.00 (5); .78 (3); .67 (1); .56 (1); and .33 (3). Since the number of subjects being scored was very low, and because no specific hypotheses were being tested by these questions, only the questions yielding the lowest reliability coefficient were eliminated from

further analysis.

The remaining 10 questions (see Appendix C) were then scored by the naive scorer for the 20 subjects not in the scoring-derivation group, using predominantly the tape recordings, and, occasionally, the protocols of the interviews. These scores were analyzed for only these 20 subjects, since the previous 10 subjects would have biased the results; a cross-tabulation analysis, using χ^2 or Fisher's exact test, was employed. The data were also re-analyzed using all 30 subjects, but these results were interpreted with extreme caution because of the inclusion of the scoring-derivation group.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Before the analyses of the dependent measures which tested the hypotheses are discussed, results pertaining to measures that serve further to describe the two groups of fathers will be presented.

There is little doubt that, although the groups were fairly well matched in age, socioeconomic status, and socioeconomic background, the selection criteria resulted in two groups which were significantly different in lifestyle, especially in the amount of their involvement in child care, the principal distinction sought. In reporting the manifestations of these lifestyle differences, results of an analysis of covariance will be reported in each case for which age was found to be a significant source of variation. In most cases, although age was a significant factor, the differences between the groups remained robust with age partialled out, and thus reflect true group differences.

First, the control group worked for pay significantly more hours per week (49.0) than the shared-caregiving group (18.4), $F(1, 27) = 25.2$, $p < .001$. At the same time, the shared-caregiving group engaged in sole child care for their child or children under 5 years of age significantly more hours per week (30.9) than the control group (10.4), $F(1, 27) = 23.8$, $p < .001$. The control group clearly had a more traditional lifestyle, working far more hours than they performed child care; the shared-caregiving group was clearly untraditional, engaging in child care considera-

bly more hours per week than they worked.

The same pattern of differences held for the number of the child's waking hours per week during which the fathers performed child care by themselves (25.9 vs. 8.2), $F(1, 27) = 28.2$, $p < .001$, and for the total number of hours per week that the fathers were available for interaction with their children (71.0 vs. 44.4), $F(1, 27) = 15.9$, $p < .001$. Even when the men's wives were at home, the shared-caregiving fathers continued to perform a significantly greater proportion of the child care (defined as physical caregiving, not including entertainment) than the control-group fathers (49.7% vs. 32.3%), $F(1, 27) = 10.4$, $p < .003$. (These results are summarized in Table 2.) In short, the shared-caregiving group is, indeed, a group of fathers who worked less than full-time and had a major or, for some, the predominant, responsibility for child care, even when their wives were at home. The fathers in the control group, on the other hand, worked at least full-time, and, while contributing significantly to child care, left the major responsibility for it to others, particularly to their wives when both of them were at home.

Turning to specific child-care tasks, the two groups differed in the same direction as above in the percentage of time, compared to their wives, that they performed most of the tasks about which they were asked: feeding, diapering, bathing, dressing, getting up in the middle of the night if the child awakens, taking the child to the doctor or dentist, playing with toys with the child, and adult activities done with the child. The only two child-care activities in which the two groups did not differ significantly were reading stories to the child and playing physically (such as rough-and-tumble). Neither of these two activities is a direct

Table 2

General Lifestyle Differences Between the Groups

Lifestyle Variable	Group				F ^a
	Shared-Caregiving		Control		
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Hours of work per week	18.4	14.8	49.0	15.6	25.2**
Hours of sole child care per week	30.9	13.3	10.4	4.6	23.8**
Hours of sole child care, child awake, per week	25.9	10.4	8.2	4.2	28.2**
Hours available for child interaction per week	71.0	16.7	44.4	14.2	15.9**
Percentage of child care done when wife is at home	49.7	10.8	32.3	13.3	10.4*

Note. F values are reported for ANCOVAs with age as a covariate because age was significantly related to the dependent variables.

^aAll analyses had df = 1, 27.

*p < .003

**p < .001

caregiving task; they are, rather, entertainment activities, which is the sort of care that traditional fathers generally engage in, at least with infants (Lamb, 1977b). In fact, if one looks only at the physical caregiving activities which are almost always performed by women (feeding, diapering, bathing, and dressing), the difference between the two groups is striking: For the shared-caregiving group, the mean is 58.3%, and for the control group, 28.1%, $t(28) = 5.42$, $p < .02$. In other words, the shared-caregiving group performs the physical caregiving tasks that are traditionally the province of women more than half the time, while the control group does these tasks just over one-fourth of the time. The data on child-care activities are summarized in Table 3..

The two groups also differed considerably in the percentage of time that they performed household tasks compared to their wives; they were different particularly in those tasks which have traditionally been performed by women. The shared-caregiving group cooked a greater proportion of the time, did laundry more, vacuumed more, cleaned house more, made beds more, and shopped for clothes for the children more. The shared-caregiving group also took out garbage a greater proportion of the time than the control group. The two groups did not differ significantly in the proportion of time that they washed dishes, performed household repairs, went grocery shopping, or performed automobile maintenance. For traditional male tasks, both groups of men still do them much more than their wives. The control-group fathers appear to be "liberated" to the extent that they wash dishes and go grocery shopping about as much as the shared-caregiving fathers. The difference between the groups can be seen clearly through a direct comparison on the five frequently performed

Table 3
 Percentage of Child-Care Tasks Performed by the Fathers
 Compared to Their Wives

Task	Group				F or t	df
	Shared-Caregiving		Control			
	M	SD	M	SD		
Feeding	65.5	16.1	26.4	15.8	14.9**	1, 13
Diapering	69.3	22.0	32.1	17.4	9.0**	1, 13
Bathing	45.7	18.8	26.5	19.9	2.71*	28
Dressing	52.7	19.3	27.2	15.2	4.02***	28
Getting up at night	59.6	25.0	33.9	22.8	2.88**	28
Taking child to doctor/ dentist	63.2	23.2	13.7	17.0	36.2***	1, 26
Indoor play	60.7	12.1	36.7	14.7	16.4***	1, 26
Outdoor play	71.7	9.8	40.0	18.0	26.8***	1, 26
Toy play	59.0	16.7	40.0	18.3	5.1*	1, 26
Adult activities	54.7	18.1	32.7	14.9	3.64***	28
Reading stories	51.1	15.6	38.0	22.7	1.79	27
Physical play	72.3	14.0	67.3	10.8	1.09	28
Total traditional female care (feed, diaper, bathe, dress)	58.3	9.5	28.1	1.7	5.42*	3

Note. F values are reported for ANCOVAs with age as a covariate when age was significantly related to the dependent variable.

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

tasks that are usually done by women: cooking, doing laundry, vacuuming, cleaning, and making beds. Over these five tasks, the mean percentage for the shared-caregiving group was 58.7, while that of the control group was 25.1, $t(4) = 13.3$, $p < .001$. The data on household tasks are summarized in Table 4.

The shared-caregiving fathers perform the daily housework tasks usually done by wives, just as they perform caregiving tasks, more than half the time, while the control-group fathers, in a fashion similar to their involvement in caregiving, do these tasks about one-fourth of the time. In short, when it comes to the really dull, time-consuming tasks, the shared-caregiving group is more than carrying its share (except, interestingly, in the case of clothes shopping for children, which remains a female bastion), while the control group is only helping, albeit a substantial amount, in these tasks. It should be noted that this amount of helping on the part of the control-group fathers appears to be substantially higher than that of most men--they are not a typically traditional group, by any means.

Although the two groups are similar in many ways, it is obvious that their daily lives are quite different. The control-group fathers are off at the office, working full-time or slightly more. When they come home, they help their wives with the housework and the child care, and even relieve their wives of child-care responsibility completely for several hours per week. They are quite involved with their children, as evidenced by the large number of hours per week that they are available for interaction with them. However, when their wives are at home, they defer to them, allowing them to do the majority of actual caregiving. The shared-

Table 4
Percentage of Household Tasks Performed by the Fathers
Compared to Their Wives

Task	Group				F or t	df
	Shared-Caregiving		Control			
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Cooking	63.0	22.1	22.8	20.2	18.8***	1, 26
Laundry	54.3	27.6	22.9	27.6	18.3***	1, 21
Vacuuming	63.7	31.7	24.0	25.0	16.4***	1, 21
Cleaning	56.7	23.3	24.0	18.0	22.7***	1, 21
Making beds	55.8	26.4	31.7	31.8	2.08*	24
Clothes shopping for children	28.7	20.4	6.5	11.0	3.71***	21
Garbage	88.1	17.6	64.2	31.0	2.53**	20
Washing dishes	52.3	15.0	40.7	28.0	1.41	28
Household repairs	79.9	26.0	86.9	12.1	.94	28
Grocery Shopping	48.3	27.0	36.3	32.7	1.10	28
Automobile maintenance	76.2	32.6	89.2	15.3	1.40	28
Total traditional female tasks (cook, laundry, vacuum, clean, make beds)	58.7	3.9	25.1	3.2	13.3*	4

Note. F values are reported for ANCOVAs with age as a covariate when age was significantly related to the dependent variable.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .02$

*** $p < .001$

caregiving fathers, on the other hand, are not the main breadwinners in their families; in fact, they spend considerably more time alone with their children than they do at paid employment, and the number of additional hours that they are available for interaction with their children is also quite large. They spend much of their time performing household tasks and child-care tasks usually thought to be the province of women, yet they also perform the traditional male household tasks as frequently as other men. Even when their wives are at home, in contrast to the control-group fathers, they continue to do half of the work involved in the direct care of their young children.

Before discussing the findings regarding the hypotheses tested, it should be noted again that there was a nearly significant difference in the ages of the fathers in the two groups. In order to test for the influence of age on differences on the dependent variables, an analysis of covariance, with age as the covariate, was performed in every case. When age was found to be a significant source of variation, the results of these analyses are reported: In most of these comparisons, the dependent measures did vary with the age of the subjects, but this variation did not negate the effects of group membership, so that it is legitimate to attribute obtained differences to group membership.

Hypothesis 1

To test this hypothesis of a greater degree of androgyny for shared-caregiving fathers, the Sex-Role Questionnaire (SRQ, with subjects describing themselves) was used. The SRQ yielded two scores for each subject: a competence-assertion cluster (male-valued) score and a warmth-expressiveness (female-valued) score. A significant difference in either

score between the groups would signify a difference in sex-role orientation.

The two groups did not differ significantly in their self-reports on the competence-assertion cluster. The mean score for the shared-caregiving group was 255.9, while the mean of the control group was 258.3, $t(28) = .31$, n.s. When analyzed using a t test, however, the two groups did differ significantly on the other, warmth-expressiveness cluster: The mean for the shared-caregiving group was 128.9, while that of the control group was 117.1, $t(28) = 2.51$, $p < .02$. However, age was a significant contributor to this difference, as indicated by the analysis of covariance, $F(1, 27) = 5.60$, $p < .025$, for the contribution of age to the variance. Using the analysis of covariance, there was a nonsignificant trend toward higher warmth-expressiveness scores for the shared-caregiving group, $F(1, 27) = 3.47$, $p < .08$. Thus, the younger men, generally in the shared-caregiving group, saw themselves as higher in warmth-expressiveness than the older men; the shared-caregiving men, with age controlled for, had a tendency to see themselves as higher in warmth-expressiveness. These results give partial support to the hypothesis of greater androgyny in the shared-caregiving group. These men view themselves as possessing masculine, competency-based traits to the same extent as other men, but they also tend to view themselves as possessing feminine, expressive traits to a somewhat greater extent than other men. In other words, they appear to be as masculine as, and more feminine than, other men--that is, more androgynous. The data on self-reported Sex-Role Questionnaire scores are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5

Sex-Role Questionnaire (SRQ) Scores for the Fathers

	Group					
	Shared-Caregiving		Control			
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u> or <u>t</u>	<u>df</u>
Competence-Assertion						
Cluster ^a	255.9	18.4	258.3	23.2	.31	28
Warmth-Expressiveness						
Cluster ^b	128.9	13.5	117.1	12.0	2.51*	28
					3.47**	1, 27

Note. F values are reported for ANCOVAs with age as a covariate when age was significantly related to the dependent variable.

^aMaximum possible score = 371.

^bMaximum possible score = 182.

*t, p < .02.

**F, p < .08.

This finding of a tendency toward higher femininity, but not lower masculinity, in shared-caregiving fathers, is consistent with most previous research. It extends the findings of Bem (1975), Bem and Lenney (1976), and Bem, Martyna, and Watson (1976), who showed that androgyny is associated with more flexible sex-role behavior than other sex-role orientations, in a laboratory. In the present case, the fathers who appeared to be more androgynous (i.e., who had a tendency to report themselves as higher in femininity, while remaining as high as other fathers in masculinity) are engaged constantly in both masculine and feminine sex-role behavior--that is, they are flexible in their sex-role behavior.

The finding is also consistent with that of Russell (in press), who reported higher self-reports of femininity in fathers who shared child care. It is not consistent with the findings of Radin (Note 2), who found that fathers who were doing more than half the child-care tasks did not differ from traditional fathers in self-reported femininity. One reason for this discrepancy could be that Radin's subjects were not necessarily doing more than half of the child care by choice; this is unclear in her report. If it is the case that her highly-involved group contained men who were performing a great deal of child care out of necessity, one would not expect these men to have higher degrees of femininity (or androgyny) than traditional men. This explanation is further supported by one other detail of Radin's (Note 2) study: Fathers who were more involved in a child's physical care (presumably, fathers who were so involved by choice rather than by necessity) had higher femininity scores than fathers who were less involved in physical care. While the evidence of the present study and Russell's (in press) study does seem to point to higher levels

of femininity with equal levels of masculinity (and thus, a greater degree of androgyny) in shared-caregiving fathers compared to more traditional fathers, it remains the task of future research to clarify this association. It is imperative that such research distinguish between fathers who share child care by choice and those who do so out of necessity, since different sex-role orientations would be expected for these two groups.

Hypothesis 2

The Sex-Role Questionnaire was analyzed in the same fashion to test this hypothesis of a greater degree of androgyny for mothers of shared-caregiving fathers, only the scoring was based on the subjects' descriptions of their mothers when the subjects were under 12 years old. The scores did not differ significantly on either the competence-assertion cluster or the warmth-expressiveness cluster. The means for the competence-assertion cluster were 216.7 for the mothers of the shared-caregiving fathers and 226.3 for the mothers of the control fathers, $t(28) = .77$, n.s. The means for the warmth-expressiveness cluster were 126.1 and 129.0 respectively, $t(28) = .50$, n.s. These results are summarized in Table 6.

These findings do not support the hypothesis. Whatever influenced the shared-caregiving fathers to adopt their lifestyles, there is no evidence that their mothers' sex-role orientation contributed to the decision.

Also relevant to this hypothesis of greater androgyny on the part of the mothers of shared-caregiving fathers are data on mothers' working when the subjects were children, obtained from the Personal Data form. This analysis revealed that, for the shared-caregiving group, seven

Table 6

Sex-Role Questionnaire (SRQ) Scores for the Subjects'
 Mothers as Perceived by the Subjects

	Group					
	Shared-Caregiving		Control			
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>
Competence-Assertion						
Cluster ^a	216.7	29.8	226.3	38.2	.77	28
Warmth-Expressiveness						
Cluster ^b	126.1	16.3	129.0	14.7	.50	28

^aMaximum possible score = 371.

^bMaximum possible score = 182.

(46.7%) of their mothers worked when they were children, and, for the control group, five (33.3%) of their mothers worked when they were children. This difference was not significant, $\chi^2(1) = .56$, n.s. A model of a working mother apparently did not contribute to the degree of involvement in child care in the men in this sample.

This finding is congruent with the above results regarding mother's sex-role orientation, and it is counter to the findings of previous researchers (e.g., DeFrain, 1979; Radin, in press), who found a significant association between mothers' working and men's sharing child care. The likely cause of this discrepancy is that previous researchers had truly traditional couples in their control groups, while the control group in the present study might best be termed "modified traditional." If this is so, then perhaps having had an androgynous, working mother does predict substantial involvement in child care by fathers; apparently having had such a mother does not, however, predict actual shared caregiving.

On the other hand, neither this study nor previous studies have found that more than half of the mothers of shared-caregiving fathers worked when the fathers were children. Nor has mother's sex-role orientation been found consistently to predict their sons' involvement in child care, although it may predict their sons' sex-role orientation. Therefore, it may be that their mothers' degree of androgyny or their mothers' employment status are not as important factors in men's child-care arrangements as previous researchers believed. Future research should focus on more subtle aspects of mothers' personality and behavior, rather than on sex-role orientation and employment status, in an attempt to distinguish the antecedents of shared caregiving, as opposed to significant partici-

pation in family life short of fully shared child care, in fathers. Subtle differences among the fathers of subjects whose mothers worked, such as degree of involvement in child care, should also be investigated; they, rather than differences among mothers, may be crucial to the child-care arrangements later chosen by the subjects.

Hypotheses 3 and 4

To test these hypotheses that shared-caregiving fathers are higher in intimacy motivation and lower in power motivation than other fathers, intimacy scores and power scores derived from the six TAT stories were compared. These comparisons are summarized in Table 7. The mean intimacy scores were 8.1 for the shared-caregiving group and 7.1 for the control group, $t(26) = .61$, n.s. While these scores show no differences in level of intimacy motivation, they do reveal an extraordinarily high intimacy motivation for the entire sample; they are higher than the scores for most men on whom data are available (McAdams, Note 8). Apparently, both groups of men are strongly oriented toward close interpersonal relationships, much more than most men.

The hypothesis regarding the power motive was also not supported. Mean scores for the two groups were 2.2 and 2.7 for the shared-caregiving and control groups respectively, $t(26) = .52$, n.s. These scores are very low for men, indicating a low power motive for the sample as a whole (McAdams, Note 8). Apparently, neither group is particularly motivated by institutionalized social power or by prestige.

Despite the fact that neither of these hypotheses was supported, the results are informative. The entire sample in this study was apparently composed of a group of men whose inner lives, whose deep, unconscious

Table 7

Intimacy and Power Motivation Scores

Motive	Group				<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>
	Shared-Caregiving		Control			
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>		
Intimacy ^a	8.1	4.9	7.1	3.9	.61	26
Power ^b	2.2	2.5	2.7	3.2	.52	26

Note. Group means on intimacy for men are usually about 5; on power, about 6 (McAdams, Note 9).

^aRange = 2 - 19.

^bRange = 0 - 12.

motives in life, are similar to each other's and different from those of most other men. Most of these fathers are very much oriented toward the experience of "a warm, close, and communicative exchange with another person" (McAdams, 1980, p. 430), and away from a "quest for power" (Winter & Stewart, 1978, p. 393) or interpersonal coercion. The two groups, then, have very similar motives in life which have, presumably, developed through similar early life experiences.

Taking the TAT stories as representative of inner fantasy life, it appears that the shared-caregiving fathers are living out their fantasies and desires to a greater extent than the other fathers, whose daily lives are somewhat more similar to those of men who do not share their motivation for much intimacy and little power. The shared-caregiving fathers have placed themselves in a position, spending most of their time doing child care, where interpersonal relationships are paramount, while the control fathers have placed themselves in a position, spending most of their time working, where interpersonal relationships must be secondary to achievement. We have little understanding of what tipped the scales of behavior in different directions for these two groups that have such important motives in common. We do know that even the development of certain deep personality characteristics in fathers will not necessarily result in their radically altering their lives so as to be full participants in housework and child care. In other words, for those who wish to promote shared caregiving of infants and young children (e.g., Dinnerstein, 1976), the development of a high intimacy (expressive) motive and a low power (instrumental) motive in men appears not to be enough. Rather, particular life experiences, probably occurring in adolescence and adult-

hood and not uncovered in the present research, apparently must interact with these motivations to produce the radically different behavior manifested by fathers who stay home much of the time to care for their young children. In short, the development of a high intimacy motive and a low power motive may predispose a man toward sharing child care, but other personality and situational factors probably determine whether or not he will act on this predisposition.

Backgrounds and Experiences

To investigate the expectation of background differences between the two groups, responses to the interview questions that had significantly distinguished the two sets of five fathers from each group which comprised the scoring-derivation group were analyzed for the other 20 fathers not in that group. Contrary to the expectation, none of the childhood background questions differentiated the groups. When the scoring-derivation group was also included in the analysis, one question did distinguish the two groups: "How, in general, were you and your sisters treated differently in regard to expectations for marriage?" Only 1 out of the 9 (11.1%) shared-caregiving subjects who had sisters reported that his parents had placed more emphasis on marriage for his sisters, while 7 of the 10 (70%) subjects who had sisters reported this subtle form of sex-role pressure. This difference was significant by Fisher's exact test, $p < .02$. This result is in the expected direction: The shared-caregiving fathers apparently came from families where there was less stereotypical treatment of boys and girls in regard to future marriage than there was for the control subjects.

It seems reasonable that a man who grew up in a family where

marriage was considered more important for girls than for boys would be more likely, at some level, to believe that it is more important for women to devote themselves to family life than it is for men. Indeed, that is how the men in the control group live: They have arranged their lives in such a fashion that their wives must devote a significantly greater proportion of their time to family life than they themselves do. The shared-caregiving fathers, on the other hand, grew up in families where there was equal emphasis on marriage for boys and girls; it seems reasonable that this would influence them to believe that family life is as important for men as for women, and, indeed, the way they spend their time is consistent with such a belief. Perhaps it is subtle differences like this in the attitudes of the subjects' parents that led one group to be more open to a radical change in sex-role behavior, while the other group, although attitudinally quite liberal, was not open to such change.

This finding should be treated tentatively and with extreme caution, since the analysis upon which it is based contained the scoring-derivation group, thus biasing the results in favor of this finding. Further research on ways in which subtle sex-role attitudes and pressures within the family are related to different degrees of involvement in family life in men is necessary. Such research should contain many more subjects than the present study, so that any conclusions can be stated more certainly than at present. The study of such differences in the original families of mothers would also be likely to shed light on the antecedents of different degrees of involvement in family life in men.

When a careful analysis was made of the Personal Data forms, it became apparent that the two groups differed in their early life experi-

ences in one other significant way. Of the shared-caregiving group, 12 of the 15 (80%) fathers were middle- or last-born children, while, of the control group, 10 of the 15 (66.7%) fathers were first-born or only children. This difference was highly significant, $\chi^2(1) = 6.65$, $p < .01$.

This finding is congruent with those of most researchers in the area of birth-order effects (Toman, 1976), who have found that oldest and only children generally are more achievement oriented than middle and last children. Middle and youngest siblings tend not to be as successful in the world of work. Thus, it is possible that the subtle psychological effects of birth order may be a factor in the different child-rearing arrangements of the groups: The control group may be fulfilling a role in their families which was partially determined by their position in the sibling hierarchy; the shared-caregiving fathers, being younger brothers, may not have felt as much pressure to fulfill such an instrumental role.

This finding, while interesting, is based on very few subjects as well as a post hoc statistical analysis. Therefore, it should serve mainly a heuristic purpose: Future researchers should investigate whether birth order and other sibling-related variables are significant antecedents of men's choices of child-care arrangement.

In summary, the background variables that distinguished the two groups were very few, and they can be stated only tentatively. There is some indication that a subtle difference in sex-role stereotyping within their original families, in the form of greater importance placed on marriage for girls than for boys, may distinguish the control fathers from the shared-caregiving fathers. There is also evidence suggesting that a father's birth order in his original family may predispose him

toward taking a more or less nurturant role in his own family; specifically, it appears that shared-caregiving fathers are more likely to be middle- or last-born children, while fathers who do not share child care are more likely to be first-born or only children.

Other Findings

Most of the data collected in this study were not obtained for the purpose of testing the few hypotheses that were formulated, but rather were meant to serve a heuristic function. These data fall into several categories: (a) further identifying data and information about the lifestyles of the subjects; (b) scores on attitude and personality measures other than those reported so far; (c) information on specific sex-role attitudes of the subjects; (d) information on adulthood experiences of the subjects; and (e) information on early life experiences of the subjects. Because these categories include only a few of the many variables that could have been explored, and because the analyses of these variables were done on a post hoc basis, any findings in this section should be regarded very cautiously.

Lifestyles. First, the fathers differed in their lifestyles in ways other than those already cited. All 15 of the control-group fathers worked full-time; only four of the shared-caregiving fathers did so, seven worked part-time, and four did not work at all, $\chi^2(2) = 17.37, p < .01$. Thus, 11 of the 15 (73.3%) shared-caregiving fathers deviated from the standard pattern of full-time work for a man in order to be involved in child care; although the control fathers were quite involved with their children, none of them gave up full-time work to become more fully involved in their children's lives. The wives of the two groups of fathers

did not differ significantly in their own work patterns: Ten of the shared-caregiving and eight of the control wives worked full-time; four of the shared-caregiving and five of the control wives worked or went to school part-time; and one of the shared-caregiving and two of the control wives did not work at all, $\chi^2(2) = .67$, n.s. Thus, only 2 of the 15 (13.3%) control-group couples were in a very traditional situation, with the husband working full-time and the wife staying at home with the children. The data on work patterns of the fathers and mothers are summarized in Table 8. In short, while the two groups were definitely different in their work patterns, the control group was not very traditional, but rather it consisted almost exclusively of fathers who were members of dual-career couples or couples in which the mother was working a significant proportion of time. The shared-caregiving group also consisted mostly of dual-career couples, except that the wives, unlike those in the control group, usually worked more than the husbands.

Looking at other data from the Personal Data forms on wives who, according to previous research (e.g., Russell, 1979, in press; Sagi, in press), affect the level of their husbands' involvement in child care, the wives of the two groups of fathers did not differ in their educational levels (93% of the shared-caregiving wives and 73% of the control wives had at least completed college), $\chi^2(3) = 2.36$, n.s. They also did not differ in the status levels of their jobs (80% of the shared-caregiving wives and 73% of the control wives were in the top three categories, according to the scheme of Hollingshead [Note 6]), $\chi^2(4) = 2.59$, n.s. Thus, most of the fathers in the study had wives with high levels of education and fairly high status jobs, at which the majority in each group

Table 8

Work Arrangements of the Subjects and Their Wives

Group	Full-time	Part-time	Not working	$\chi^2(2)$
Husbands				
Shared-Caregiving	4	7	4	17.37*
Control	15	0	0	
Wives				
Shared-Caregiving	10	4	1	.67
Control	8	5	2	

* $p < .01$

worked full-time.

Thus, none of the indicators associated with wives, such as working full-time, that have predicted fathers' involvement in child care in previous studies (Radin, in press; Russell, in press; Sagi, in press) did so in the present study. This lack of support for previous findings is probably due to the fact that most of the men in the sample were highly involved in child care, and most of the wives were working full-time at high-status positions; therefore, the range for these two variables was small. Such factors as wives' working, wives' working full-time rather than part-time, and wives' educational and occupational status may predict the degree of involvement in child care on the part of their husbands to some extent; but these factors do not distinguish shared-caregiving fathers from significantly involved, modified-traditional fathers. The present finding, then, extends, rather than negates, the previous findings: A wife who works full-time at a high status job may indeed affect her husband's degree of involvement in child care, but her influence is not enough to propel most men into a shared-caregiving situation. More detailed research on the wives of shared-caregiving fathers is necessary to discover more subtle variables that may distinguish them from the wives of traditional or modified-traditional fathers.

For almost all of the men in both groups, the decision about what kind of child-care arrangement to have had been a mutual one, suggesting that the couples in both groups were comfortable in their arrangements, which were definitely different. Five of the shared-caregiving fathers were the primary caregivers for their young children (that is, they were solely in charge of their care for more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ weekdays per week), while

none of the control fathers was the primary caregiver. None of the shared-caregiving wives was a primary caregiver, while two of the control wives were. The control group relied on substitute caregivers (primarily pre-schools and baby sitters) as primary caregivers twice as much as the shared-caregiving group (10 vs. 5 families), while five of the shared-caregiving families and three of the control families used a combination of either both parents or a parent and a substitute caregiver as the primary caregivers. These differences were significant, $\chi^2(3) = 9.16$, $p < .05$; the data are summarized in Table 9. Looked at another way, two-thirds of the control families had their children primarily taken care of by substitute caregivers, while only one-third of the shared-caregiving families did so. On the other hand, two-thirds of the shared-caregiving families had a parent with their children for at least $2\frac{1}{2}$ weekdays per week, while only one-third of the control families had this arrangement.

The children under the age of five of the control-group fathers spent significantly more hours in preschool per week (22.4) than the children under the age of five of the shared-caregiving fathers (9.8), $t(37) = 2.3$, $p < .05$. Only 5 of the 20 (25%) children under 5 years old of the control-group fathers did not attend preschool, while 10 of the 19 (53%) children under 5 years old of the shared-caregiving fathers did not attend. The control group appears to have made the choice that is most often advocated for couples in which the husband and wife both want to work: Find substitute child care. The shared-caregiving group appears to have made a much different choice: to have a parent with the children most of the time, rearranging work schedules and sacrificing income so that this can occur.

Table 9

Child-Care Arrangements of the Subjects and Their Wives

Group	Primary Caregiver				$\chi^2(3)$
	Father	Mother	Substitute	Mixed	
Shared-Caregiving	5	0	5	5	9.16*
Control	0	2	10	3	

* $p < .05$

Further evidence for the fact that the two groups were qualitatively different comes from the fathers' descriptions of what they liked and disliked about their child-care arrangements. While 12 of the shared-caregiving fathers mentioned that they enjoyed the time they had with their children, only 3 of the control fathers mentioned this. Nor did the control fathers appear to dislike working full-time, which is the normative role for men: Only one of them complained of feeling locked in to the traditional role. Nine of the control fathers mentioned the quality of the substitute care they had found as a plus, while none of the shared-caregiving fathers mentioned this. When asked whether they had ever considered or wanted a different child-care arrangement, most of the fathers in both groups replied in the negative. It appears, then, that the shared-caregiving fathers are quite pleased with being home with their children a great deal of the time rather than working most of the time, while the control fathers are pleased that they have found good substitute caregivers so that child-care responsibilities do not interfere with their and their wives' working. Thus, the values the two groups place on work and child care appear to differ in a subtle fashion. The shared-caregiving group seems to believe that it is worthwhile to give up some work time for the sake of child care, while the control group would, for the most part, rather rely on substitute caregivers so that they can continue working full-time.

In summary, the lifestyles of the two groups of fathers are similar in many ways, yet their lives are significantly qualitatively different. Both groups have wives who are well-educated and who hold, for the most part, full-time jobs that are toward the upper end of the status

continuum. Clearly, both groups consist mostly of men who believe in women's sharing the male work role. The real difference between the groups is in the value they place on parenting, on sharing the female child-care role. For the shared-caregiving fathers, their wives are the principal breadwinners; they rely mostly on parental care for their young children, of which they themselves do a very significant amount. The control-group fathers fit more closely the model of dual-career couples' lifestyles described by Tavris (1973) and Berger and Wright (1978), in which the wives do most of the child care when both the husband and wife are at home, and the children are with substitute caregivers a substantial portion of the rest of the time. The two groups are equally enthusiastic about the arrangements they have chosen: The shared-caregiving fathers enjoy their time with their children, and the control fathers are pleased to be working and are happy with the substitute care they have found for their children.

Attitude and personality measures. Two other dependent measures separated the two groups. The most striking of these was the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). Even though age was a significant covariate when these scores were compared for the two groups, $F(1, 27) = 12.89$, $p < .001$, they were still very significantly different in their AWS scores, $F(1, 27) = 20.55$, $p < .001$. Thus, while younger men tended to have higher, more egalitarian scores on the AWS, so did the shared-caregiving men ($M = 43.4$ vs. $M = 36.1$ for the control group, out of a maximum score of 45).

The scores indicate that both groups of men had profeminist, egalitarian attitudes; their scores are, in fact, close to the maximum possible score of 45. However, the fact that they were still different is

telling: The shared-caregiving fathers on the whole agreed strongly with profeminist statements, while the control fathers, on the whole, agreed mildly with many of the same statements. The shared-caregiving fathers seem to believe in true equality for the sexes, while the control fathers seem to be more hesitant in this same belief. In other words, the shared-caregiving fathers appear to be nonsexist in their attitudes, while the control fathers appear to be slightly sexist. Since the main factors distinguishing the shared-caregiving group from the control group are their arrangements for work and child care, this finding appears to support Dinnerstein's (1976) contention that fathers' sharing equally the responsibility for child care would be associated with a reduction in sexist attitudes.

The finding could also be interpreted to support Tavris's (1973) conclusion that there is a gap between men's attitudes about sex roles and their participation in family life, or it could be interpreted to support the idea of continuity between sex-role attitudes and behavior. The men in the control group favor equality, for the most part, but the percentage of time that they spend in most household tasks and in child care, while high, did not equal the percentage of time spent by their wives in these pursuits, particularly when both the husbands and wives are at home. This fact reflects a gap between the control group's egalitarian attitudes toward women, and their actual behavior. Looked at from another angle, however, the control group's moderately egalitarian responses to the Attitudes Toward Women Scale appear to be consistent with their moderately egalitarian behavior. The shared-caregiving fathers responded to the Attitudes Toward Women Scale in an extremely egalitarian fashion, and they

are leading what closely resembles a truly egalitarian lifestyle. Thus, attitudes about sex roles may be at least somewhat predictive of the role a man takes in child care, with extremely egalitarian views being associated with sharing equally in child-care and household responsibilities.

The difference between the groups in the degree to which they hold nonsexist views was one of the most robust findings in the present study. Still, because of the post hoc nature of this finding, this difference between involved, modified-traditional fathers and shared-caregiving fathers needs to be tested by further research. Future research should also investigate in what other ways subtle differences in degrees of sexism in attitudes distinguish the two groups.

The other dependent measure on which the two groups were significantly different was the mastery scale of the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire (WFOQ). The mean for the shared-caregiving group was 19.2, while that of the control group was 22.0, $t(28) = 2.55$, $p < .02$; age was not a significant source of this difference. There were no significant differences in the other aspects of achievement motivation that the WFOQ measures--work, competence, and personal unconcern--although there was a slight trend toward a difference in the total WFOQ scores, $t(28) = 1.54$, $p < .13$.

Thus, the two groups do not appear to differ in most aspects of achievement motivation, but only in the particular area of mastery, which involves gaining enjoyment from mastering difficult, challenging tasks as opposed to working at something that comes more easily. This may indicate a difference in the subjects' felt necessity to prove themselves; the shared-caregiving fathers may feel confident enough about their own

abilities that they don't need constantly to overcome challenges in order to continue feeling that way. On the other hand, it may be that the shared-caregiving fathers simply prefer to relax and perform routine, easy tasks more than the control fathers. In our culture, rearing children and running a household are seen as easier and more routine than going out into the world of work; these men may indeed find the former less of a challenge than working, and they may be more comfortable in such a role. They may, also, be slightly less achievement oriented on the whole than most other men, and this lower achievement motivation could be a significant factor in their limiting their career development for the sake of being highly involved in their children's rearing.

The two groups did not differ in their levels of self-esteem. The mean for the shared-caregiving group was 2.8, while the mean for the control group was identical. Although androgyny and self-esteem have previously been shown to be related (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975), in this case behavior that is indicative of androgyny was not correlated with self-esteem. The scores for the entire sample are slightly higher than the norms given by Helmreich and Stapp (1974), and they indicate a moderately high level of self-esteem for all of these fathers. It appears that men who have opted to spend a significant amount of their time staying home and taking care of young children are not doing so because they lack the self-confidence to "make it" in the world. Nor does it appear that such men have higher self-confidence than other men who, while spending a great deal of time with their children, have not radically deviated from the traditional male family role. If one considers self-esteem as an index of mental health, it appears that shared-caregiving

fathers are neither more nor less mentally healthy than other fathers of similar status.

The other dependent measure, the Sex-Role Questionnaire (SRQ) scores for the subjects' fathers, revealed how the subjects now perceived their fathers to have been when the subjects were under 12 years old. This measure did not distinguish the two groups. There was a nonsignificant trend for the fathers of the control-group subjects to receive higher scores on the competence-assertion dimension, while the two sets of fathers were much closer in their scores on the warmth-expressiveness cluster. The shared-caregiving group, then, may have had fathers who did not model the traditional masculine role quite as strongly as the fathers of the other men, perhaps leaving them more receptive to deviations, for themselves, from that traditional role later on in life. This speculation needs to be tested on a far larger sample than that employed in the present study. Since fathers serve as the most important models of what it means to be a man, future studies should look at other objective measures of fathers' personalities, to find out in what ways the fathers of shared-caregiving fathers provided a model different from the norm.

Since few of the written, objective measures distinguished the two groups, a stepwise discriminant analysis using the measures that did distinguish them and others that showed a trend toward group differences was performed, with the hope of finding a pattern that would separate the two groups. The measures included in the analysis were: (a) the warmth-expressiveness cluster score from the Sex-Role Questionnaire (self-description); (b) the mastery score from the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire; (c) the Attitudes Toward Women Scale score;

(d) the competence-assertion cluster score from the Sex-Role Questionnaire (description of father); and (e) the total achievement score from the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire. The subjects' fathers' competence-assertion scores were dropped from this analysis, because they did not contribute enough to the variance.

The discriminant analysis revealed the following standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients: warmth-expressiveness (self-description), .53; mastery scale of the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire, -.33; Attitudes Toward Women Scale, .78; and total achievement on the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire, -.39. These coefficients indicate the following pattern for members of the shared-caregiving group: a high score on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale and on the warmth-expressiveness cluster of the Sex-Role Questionnaire, coupled with relatively low scores on the mastery scale of the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire and on the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire as a whole (which are, of course, correlated). When this pattern was used to classify the subjects into two groups, it correctly classified 13 (86.7%) of the shared-caregiving subjects and 14 (93.3%) of the control subjects, for an overall correct classification rate of 90.0%. Thus, the pattern that emerges for the shared-caregiving fathers is that of a man with extremely liberal attitudes toward the rights and roles of women, who views himself as having more feminine personality characteristics than most men (even other liberally-minded men), and who has a lower need to undertake difficult challenges and to achieve in general than most men. This description must be treated with extreme caution, both because of the post hoc nature of the analysis and because the statistical procedure

itself tends to magnify differences between groups.

The combination of characteristics noted above, however, does seem intuitively reasonable: Men who are sharing child care within a marriage would be expected to have egalitarian attitudes about sex roles, since they are purposefully either reversing roles or sharing roles themselves. These men are engaging in an activity, child care, which requires a great deal of warmth and expressiveness, which have been traditionally considered feminine traits, so it is logical that they rate themselves high on these traits. The task of rearing children does not call for mastery of the same type of challenges that are common to the work of upper-middle class men: thus, the lower need for mastery. Finally, child care is not recognized as an achievement as much as work, so it is not surprising that shared-caregiving fathers may be lower in achievement motivation in general than other fathers. It would seem logical, too, for a man, such as those in the shared-caregiving group, who is not so oriented toward mastery in the world of work, who is strongly egalitarian in his attitudes toward sex roles, and who has a very expressive side to his personality, to choose to share a task that would allow him to express both his feminine side and his liberal attitudes. Men such as those in the control group, who have a fairly liberal attitude toward sex roles, but who do not view themselves as very expressive or feminine, and who do need to master difficult challenges, would seem less likely to decrease their participation in work (where they fulfill their need for mastery) to participate in child care (which requires more expressiveness). While the composite of a shared-caregiving father provided by the discriminant analysis makes sense intuitively, it should be

taken only as a guide for future research, which should test each part of the composite on enough subjects that meaningful conclusions can be drawn.

In summary, the objective attitudinal and personality measures indicate that both groups had highly profeminist attitudes, with the shared-caregiving group being more profeminist than the control group. The two groups seem to be equal in their levels of self-esteem, and they perceived their own fathers as about equal to each other in their masculine and feminine personality characteristics, although there is slight evidence that the fathers of shared-caregiving subjects were less masculine than those of control subjects. A very tentative attitudinal and personality composite of a shared-caregiving father was generated: a man who is very liberal in his attitudes about feminism, who perceives himself as higher in feminine traits than most men, and who has a lower need for mastery and achievement in general than most men. Further research to test these findings is needed.

Specific sex-role attitudes. Very subtle attitudes besides the degree of agreement with profeminist attitudes uncovered in the analysis of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale may also distinguish the two groups of fathers. In response to the question, "What parental functions do you feel are more suitable for mothers?", all 10 of the shared-caregiving fathers who were not in the scoring-derivation group for the interview replied "none" or mentioned only breastfeeding. In the control group, on the other hand, five of the subjects mentioned some other function besides breastfeeding which they thought was more suitable for mothers, while five replied as the shared-caregiving subjects did. This difference was significant; Fisher's exact test yielded $p < .03$. The other

parental functions thought to be more suitable for mothers by the control fathers centered mostly around emotional responsiveness to babies: Several of the fathers thought that, when it comes to being really tuned to the nuances of a baby, mothers are better suited than fathers.

A significant proportion of the control fathers, then, sees mothers as really more suitable as caregivers, while none of the shared-caregiving fathers views them in that fashion. Even though several of the control fathers mentioned that these functions were more suitable for mothers because of sex-role training, the fact that they mentioned them at all, while the shared-caregiving fathers did not, seems to this author to imply a support of the sex-role status quo. This subtle support for the idea that certain apparently nonbiologically based parental functions are more suitable for women probably exerted some influence on these fathers not to share child care, while the belief on the part of the shared-caregiving fathers that there are no functions besides breastfeeding that are more suitable for mothers probably exerted some influence on them to share fully in child-care tasks. Although it is likely that the attitudes about child-care functions more suitable for mothers preceded the choice of child-care arrangements, this interpretation, which is based on correlational evidence, needs further exploration to assess directly this possible causal link. The control group appears to accept, however reluctantly, deeply held cultural beliefs about sex roles, and to act according to these beliefs. The shared-caregiving group, on the other hand, appears to reject these beliefs, and to act according to their own nontraditional beliefs.

The other question to which the groups replied almost significantly

differently ($p < .06$, Fisher's exact test) was "Do you believe that little boys should be given dolls? Why or why not?" Nine of the shared-care-giving fathers who were not in the scoring-derivation group gave an unconditional "yes" in response to this question, while only four of the control fathers gave such a response. Five of the control fathers either said "no" or placed some sort of condition or voiced reservations in saying "yes." If the scoring-derivation group is included in the analysis, the difference is more dramatic: 13 of the shared-caregiving fathers said "yes" without reservations, and only two gave some sort of reservation; only six of the control fathers said "yes" without reservation, while nine said "no" or qualified their affirmative responses. While the interpretation of this statistical test should be extremely cautious due to the inclusion of the scoring-derivation group, the Fisher's exact test for these data yielded a $p < .001$.

The hesitations that were voiced by the control fathers fell into one of the following categories: (a) Boys are not interested in dolls; (b) Playing with dolls is not masculine; (c) Sexual preference may be adversely affected (despite intellectual knowledge that this fear has no basis); or (d) Other people may react adversely to a boy's interest in dolls. Again, one sees that almost all the fathers in the sample endorsed the idea of giving dolls to boys, which is certainly a liberal attitude; but there was a subtle difference between the groups, suggesting that those who share child care believe more strongly in crossing traditional sex-role boundaries with children than those who do not share child care. It is quite likely that these attitudes are communicated to the subjects' children: The son of a typical control father

may be given a doll, but he may also receive the message that it is not completely all right for him to play with it. This could certainly have an effect later on the son's attitudes and behavior in regard to expressing nurturance toward his own children. Thus, these subtle attitudinal differences between the two groups could have important effects on how they raise their children and on what kinds of sex-role attitudes and behaviors their children develop. Whether or not such subtle attitudinal differences do indeed have these effects needs to be explored in future research of a longitudinal nature. Such research would likely shed light on the subtle psychological factors that serve to perpetuate the male-female child-care arrangements that have prevailed for so long (Dinnerstein, 1976).

Other than the differences just reviewed, the two groups were quite similar in the attitudes about which they were asked. Most of the subjects did not believe that there is a "maternal instinct" in women that does not have a counterpart in men, and most believed that men can function as adequately as women as caregivers for babies and young children. In addition, most felt that there are no parental functions that are more suitable for fathers.

These similarities are interesting in light of the tendency, noted above, for control-group fathers to believe that there are certain parental functions that are more suitable for mothers. There appears to be a contradiction here: The control fathers believe that men also have a "maternal instinct," that they can function as adequately as women as caregivers, and that no parental functions are more suitable for men. Still, they tend to believe that there are parental functions that are

more suitable for women. Even though several of them noted that this was the case only because of sex-role socialization, the question remains: Why did the control group interpret the question to mean "more suitable, whether due to biological or sex-role socialization differences," while the shared-caregiving group did not? The answer may be that many of the control-group fathers have lingering doubts about the potential for equality in caregiving ability between men and women, while the shared-caregiving group may not have such doubts.

All of the men in both groups believed, without qualification or reservation, that it is appropriate to give toy trucks to little girls. This reply, for some of the control-group fathers, is inconsistent with their affirmative, but hesitant, replies to the question about giving dolls to boys. If one were to make a feminist interpretation of this set of replies, one might label them a "double standard." The control-group fathers, without reservation, encourage the performance of traditionally masculine behavior (playing with trucks) by girls, but many of them have reservations about the performance of traditionally feminine behavior (playing with dolls) by boys. Apparently, this group believes less strongly in males' performing female roles than it does in females' performing male roles. As has already been seen, this is consistent with their marital structures, in which their wives are, for the most part, involved full-time in the male world of work, but the husbands do not participate as fully as their wives in the female world of housework and child care.

In short, while the two groups of fathers have many of the same attitudes about sex-role behavior (attitudes which are very liberal, it

seems, compared to those of most men in American society), a close examination of the attitudes of the control group reveals a tendency toward contradictions. The contradictions suggest to this writer, at least, a subtle, unspoken belief that the care of infants and young children is really more suitable for women. They also suggest an unspoken belief that young boys should not be encouraged too strongly to practice behaviors that may prepare them for roles as significant caregivers--at least not as strongly as girls should be encouraged to practice behaviors that might prepare them for roles in the working world. While this interpretation of the data is speculative, it is consistent with the behavior and verbalized attitudes of these fathers.

Adulthood experiences. The investigator had suspected that adulthood experiences, particularly opportunities to gain knowledge about children, early bonding with their own children, and the effects of the changing cultural climate, might be significant antecedents of shared-caregiving in fathers. None of the items pertaining to adulthood experiences, however, differentiated the two groups. Neither group had much contact with young children prior to becoming fathers; both groups of men, in general, reported having read only a small amount about child care or child development. It is unlikely, then, that the shared-caregiving group became so involved with their children because of any greater knowledge, or even desire for knowledge (as evidenced by the amount of reading they had done), about children's development or care. In other words, they were not a group of men who, having had contact with young children, found that they enjoyed being with them, and decided to spend more time with their own children. Nor were they motivated, apparently, by having read

books about children that stimulated their interest in being direct caregivers. Russell (in press) had found a nonsignificant trend for shared-caregiving fathers to have read more books on child care or child rearing; the present findings, although based on a small sample, would not support the existence even of a trend in that direction as an antecedent of shared caregiving.

Other factors indicating commitment to a child, which, it had been thought, might be related to the phenomenon of shared caregiving, also did not distinguish the groups. Almost all of the children in both groups were planned; thus, the two groups of men were about equally committed to having children. Almost all the fathers attended prenatal classes (in most cases, for all of their children), and, in most cases, the classes dealt with the Lamaze method of childbirth. Almost all of the children of both groups were born using the Lamaze technique, and, in most cases, the fathers attended the births. Most of the fathers reported doing a great deal of child care in the first 3 months of their children's lives, including a significant amount of diaper-changing. The real degree of involvement in the first 3 months was difficult to gauge, since the fathers were asked only for a global estimate, but the two groups apparently did not differ. For the most part, the shared-caregiving fathers were not truly sharing child care in the first 3 months; like the control group, they were usually working, while their wives were at home with the baby. These results give no evidence, then, that wanting a child and being very involved in its birth and early care leads fathers to share child-care responsibilities. This finding is contrary to Russell's (in press) finding that attendance at prenatal classes and at

their children's birth was significantly associated with shared caregiving. The present results are, however, consistent with Russell's prediction that such factors would become nonsignificant predictors of shared caregiving as father involvement in the birth process became more popular in the culture at large.

Although they do not predict shared caregiving, attendance at birth and helping with early child care may increase later involvement, as previous research (e.g., Lind, Note 5) has suggested. It may be, however, that fathers who are planning to be significantly involved with their young children's care are more likely to attend the births, etc., and that doing so does not affect their degree of later involvement. At any rate, the degree of involvement in the birth process and early caregiving in this study did not predict shared caregiving. The results do indicate, however, that the sample as a whole was quite committed to their children even before conception; the men became fathers by choice, not by happenstance. Since involvement at birth and shortly thereafter does not predict shared caregiving, future research should concentrate on more subtle antecedents of shared caregiving, such as the exact degree and kind of involvement in the birth and early care, in the prenatal, perinatal, and early postnatal periods.

Finally, the two groups did not differ in their reports of the effects of the women's and men's movements on their marital relationships. Most of the men had not heard of the men's movement (which is a counterpart to the women's movement that seeks to reduce sexism by altering men's sex-role behavior), and did not express an interest in it, although four of the shared-caregiving fathers belonged to a support

group for fathers who were sharing child care. Most of the fathers believed that the women's movement had affected their marriages only a little or not at all. They did express the feeling that their marriages were affected by the general cultural climate: For the control group, this effect seemed mostly to be in terms of their wives' working and their being significantly involved in the home. For the shared-caregiving fathers, the cultural climate made it easier for them to undertake their unusual role. While the investigator had thought that the shared-caregiving group might have had experiences with the men's and women's movements that led them to undertake shared child care, the evidence clearly does not support this idea. It is likely, however, that none of the men in the sample would have been as involved with his children as he was were it not for the women's movement. Therefore, it is most likely that such movements are a factor in the choice to share child care, but they are neither a decisive factor nor one that distinguishes shared-caregiving fathers from other involved fathers; rather, they form a general, supportive background for the movement of men into caregiving roles.

In summary, the adulthood experiences about which information was obtained bore no relationship to the choice of child-care arrangement for the two groups. Planning one's children, being significantly involved in the birth process and the early caregiving, and being interested in the women's movement do not, apparently, distinguish fathers who share child care from those who are strongly concerned with their children but do not. Future research should concentrate on more detailed information, such as the exact kind of involvement in the birth and early care, about these and other adulthood experiences, in an effort to determine how they may

affect men's choice of child-care arrangement.

Early life experiences. The lack of differences in most childhood experiences and in the nature of relationships with parents between the two groups is surprising. One would expect, based upon social learning theory, that the two groups would have experienced somewhat different forms of modeling on the part of their parents. Instead, both groups of fathers generally described situations in which they were closer to their mothers, who did most of their early caregiving, than to their fathers, who did very little of their caregiving. None of the fathers in either group experienced anything approaching a shared-caregiving situation. Their fathers ranged in degree of affection from very warm to very withdrawn, but there was no consistent pattern in either group. Most of the subjects had predominantly typical male toys and played predominantly male games when they were children. There was a tendency for the shared-caregiving group to mention social games more and sports less than the control group; this tendency did not hold up under actual scoring, but should be investigated in future research. It would seem logical that social games would prepare a boy for a more interactive role in a family than sports, which are usually achievement oriented.

The fathers were generally socialized with middle-class values, and there were no differences between the two groups in their parents' encouragement or discouragement of male or female activities on the part of their sons; both groups seemed to have had fairly permissive parents, and sex typing appeared to be mild, but certainly existent, for both groups. For example, in most of their families, boys were encouraged to be more independent than girls, while girls were encouraged to be more emotional.

Although achievement pressure was about the same on boys and girls in their families, there were subtle pressures regarding appropriate occupations, or else the importance of finding a career was more stressed for the boys. The subjects were also about evenly divided in their experiences of nurturant male figures as they grew up. Finally, their early social relationships were similar: Both groups tended to play mostly with other boys when they were young, and almost all of the fathers reported that they did not shy away from typical male behavior, nor did they want to engage in female behavior.

The basic outline of early childhood experiences, then, was similar for both groups--at least as far as the present study probed. It is not known whether the outline revealed is typical of men in their thirties in American society. Given the fact that the control group consisted of fathers who were involved in child care and thus was not a really typical group, it may be that the backgrounds of most of the men in the sample predisposed them to being nurturant with their children. This speculation needs to be tested using a larger sample that would include more typical men than the current control group. Such a study would help to reveal how much the backgrounds of the present group of men have in common with those who spend very little time taking care of their young children.

It is also not known if the relative lack of differences found in early childhood experiences between these two groups means that they really had similar backgrounds. Given the fact that a few differences, such as in subtle sex-role pressure, were found, it is likely that there are other subtle differences which the present project did not discover.

Although, to this writer's knowledge, this study involves the first in-depth interview probe of the early lives of shared-caregiving fathers, it appears not to have probed deeply enough--nor were there enough subjects to reveal statistically most of the subtle, but possibly significant, differences that may exist between these fathers and other fathers who are less intensely involved in child care. Therefore, future research should explore even more deeply the early lives of these fathers, concentrating particularly on subtle attitudes conveyed and subtle behaviors displayed by their parents, which might have given the shared-caregiving fathers the message that they were not necessarily destined to carry out a typical male role in society. If this is done, future studies should reveal more clearly than this one has some of the early antecedents in the lives of fathers who share child care with their wives.

These findings suggest that the early, personality-forming experiences of the two groups were quite similar. Even when the two groups of subjects were asked to reflect on what early experiences they thought had influenced them to choose their child-care arrangement, they responded in a similar fashion. Many cited identification with their mothers, while others cited a warm, nurturant father who served as a sort of anti-model; this gives support to both the modeling and compensatory hypotheses regarding the development of shared caregiving suggested by Sagi (in press) and Radin (Note 4). The control-group subjects usually referred to their child-care arrangement, in response to this question, as one in which they were quite involved with their children, rather than as one which was fairly traditional. When pressed as to why they actually had a traditional or modified-traditional child-care arrangement, given their

belief that fathers should be very involved with their children, most of the control-group fathers pointed out that they were simply following tradition (without reason), that they could earn more money than their wives, or that their wives wanted to be with the children more. There was a tendency among the shared-caregiving men, in answering the same question about their nontraditional arrangement, to mention that their father or some other close adult male in their childhood had had a casual attitude toward work and achievement, so that the subjects, too, had come to believe these to be less important than most men in our culture believe them to be. Others cited parents who had fostered their thinking creatively and leaving all options open; this unconventional kind of thinking led them, as adults, they thought, to their present situation. Others reported that they were rebelling against the usual male role, portrayed by a father who took that role seriously and was very unavailable to the subject when he was young.

What, then, can we conclude about early social and personality development in men who share child care with their wives? While the present findings allow no definite conclusions, it appears that there are several factors at work: (a) subtle differences from the norm in parental attitudes toward sex roles (e.g., equal emphasis on the importance of marriage for boys and girls); (b) a tendency for parents to promote creative, untraditional thinking in their children; (c) some sort of message, either behavioral or attitudinal, from important adult males, that work and achievement are not the central parts of a man's life; or (d) having had a father who was so involved in work that he was emotionally unavailable to the subject. There are probably many other factors

which the present research did not uncover. Future researchers should look for subtle early influences such as those just mentioned, as well as for experiences during adolescent and adult development, which the present research did not closely examine. It may be that shared-caregiving fathers have early backgrounds similar to those of other men in liberal, dual-career couples, and that it is the interaction of these early experiences with later influences, such as their wives' attitudes toward child care, that is crucial to whether or not such a man becomes a shared-caregiving father.

Conclusions

In light of the many findings discussed, what can be concluded about the personalities, motivations, and antecedents of shared caregiving on the part of fathers in intact families? The present study allows for few firm conclusions, for which there appear to be two main methodological reasons: (a) The study contained a small number of subjects, which increased the chances that group differences would not be found statistically even if they actually existed, and (b) The control group in the study was self-selected in the direction of men who apparently found fatherhood more important than most men do, and who were involved with their children's care more than most fathers. This similarity of the control group to the shared-caregiving group was unintended; the measures that were chosen and the interview that was constructed, it was thought, would effectively distinguish a traditional group of fathers from a shared-caregiving group, so that much would be learned about the latter group. In short, the original intent of the research was not to study two similar groups who differed mostly in the crucial area of child-care arrange-

ments, but to study a group of traditional fathers compared to a group of shared-caregiving fathers. Future researchers can avoid these methodological difficulties by selecting a larger number of subjects and by selecting a control group that is more representative of fathers of young children. Another worthwhile approach would be purposefully to contrast two groups similar to those in the present study, but to choose objective measures and interview questions that would probe more subtle aspects of the fathers' personalities, motivations, and backgrounds than the present study did. This approach would be the most promising for the discovery of variables associated with the crucial difference, child-care arrangements, between these two otherwise similar groups.

Despite these methodological problems, some conclusions can be drawn, and other, tentative findings, that would be appropriate for future exploration, can be stated. None of these conclusions is very statistically clear-cut, so all of them should be regarded very cautiously. Turning first to various aspects of personality, the present study gave some support, in the form of a nonsignificant trend ($p < .10$), to earlier findings (e.g., Russell, in press) that shared-caregiving fathers are higher in self-reported femininity than other fathers, while they are about as high as other fathers in masculinity. Whether this androgynous sex-role orientation is an antecedent or an effect of role sharing is difficult to say. A longitudinal study of men's sex-role orientations, starting before they become fathers and adopt different child-care arrangements, would be necessary to clarify this relationship. If psychological androgyny is found to be a significant antecedent of shared caregiving, then the antecedents of androgyny itself need to be explored more fully.

Previous research (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975) has shown androgyny and self-esteem to be significantly related. In the present case, the two groups were the same in levels of self-esteem, even though one group was more behaviorally, and psychologically, androgynous. This suggests that shared-caregiving behavior is not the result of higher or lower levels of self-esteem in the fathers who undertake it. Other, more subtle personality variables are probably more important, and they should be pursued in future research.

One of those variables that is a promising differentiator is attitudes. It appears that shared-caregiving fathers are distinguished by extremely egalitarian attitudes toward the roles of men and women, as evidenced by scores on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, and by unequivocal replies to subjective questions regarding the suitability of mothers for child care and the suitability of dolls as toys for young boys. The liberal fathers in the control group seemed less fully committed to egalitarian attitudes; they were more ambivalent in their support of egalitarianism. More research needs to be done on the subtle beliefs about roles for men and women that perpetuate, as well as counteract, the predominant gender arrangements in our society (Dinnerstein, 1976).

Motives are an important source of variation in behavior (e.g., Atkinson, 1958), and they may play an important part in the decision to share child care. The results of the present study suggest that motivation to master difficult challenges is lower in men who share child care. This may help them to withdraw somewhat from the world of work and focus more on family life. There is some indication, also, that shared-caregiving fathers may be lower in achievement motivation than other fathers.

Both of these tendencies need to be confirmed and explored in greater depth in future studies.

The motives of intimacy and power may also be related, the former positively and the latter negatively, to the phenomenon of shared caregiving. No conclusion in this regard can be drawn from the present results, however, because the two groups did not differ in intimacy motivation or power motivation as manifested by fantasy story productions stimulated by thematic apperception cards. Nevertheless, both groups seemed to be very high in intimacy motivation and very low in power motivation, so this combination may indeed predispose men to nurturant behavior toward their children. Future investigations using subjects showing a wider range of nurturant behavior would clarify this relationship.

There were surprisingly few childhood experience variables that distinguished the two groups. One of the most striking of these was birth order: It appears that shared-caregiving fathers are disproportionately middle- or last-born children, which is consistent with previous research indicating that children in these positions do not achieve as much in the work world as oldest and only siblings (Toman, 1976). Future studies of shared caregiving should include this variable to check this relationship.

The ways that parents influence their sons who later share child care are probably quite subtle. Such variables as androgynous sex-role orientations and androgynous behavior (especially working, on the part of mothers), according to the present findings, seem to be weak predictors of shared caregiving, which is in contrast to previous findings (DeFrain, 1979; Radin, in press; Russell, Note 3). Rather, subtle attitudes regarding sex-role functioning, which are conveyed to children, seem more

likely to influence the later decision of whether or not to share child care. The results of this study suggest, for instance, that the parents of shared-caregiving fathers did not convey to their children any message about the relative importance of marriage for girls and boys, while the parents of the control-group fathers conveyed the feeling that marriage is more important for girls than boys. Such subtle manifestations of sex-role stereotyping on the part of parents should be explored more fully in future investigations, and they may reveal better than more global measures (e.g., sex-role orientation, employment status) how parents influence the choice of child-care arrangement by their sons.

Some shared-caregiving fathers had a tendency to indicate that their fathers or some other adult male who was important during their childhood conveyed a message, verbally and/or behaviorally, that working hard was not necessarily the primary role for a man; the control group did not indicate this. This is a subtle manifestation of what might be called "reverse sex-role socialization." Other shared-caregiving fathers reported having fathers who were "workaholics," who obtained all of their satisfaction in life from work; their sons said that they rebelled against this attitude about work. Thus, the present study tentatively supports both the modeling and compensatory hypotheses that have been put forth to explain fathers' engaging in shared caregiving. Again, while the two groups of fathers of the subjects did not differ in global measures like degree of androgyny and employment status, the study of such subtle attitudinal differences about the roles of men and women on the part of parents would likely be helpful for an understanding of how the early socialization of shared-caregiving fathers differed from that

of fathers who maintain a traditional child-care arrangement.

The present study focused primarily on current personality and motivational characteristics, as well as on childhood experiences, as variables potentially associated with shared caregiving. These variables, as was pointed out above, were limited in their ability to predict child-care arrangement. The few potential adulthood antecedents that were explored--experience with and knowledge about children, participation in childbirth and early child care, having a wife with a high level of education and a high level of employment status--proved incapable of predicting shared caregiving, which was in contrast to the findings of previous researchers (e.g., Russell, in press). These findings, as well as the findings of so many similarities in the major aspects of early life experiences of the two groups of fathers, suggest that the crucial, decisive factors antecedent to shared caregiving may be related to subtle differences in experiences in adolescence and in adulthood (e.g., their wives' attitudes) that were not explored in this study. Although Dinnerstein (1976) suggests that it is very early life experiences that predispose men to perpetuate the prevailing child-care arrangement, future research should include in-depth explorations of fathers' later life experiences, including personality characteristics of their wives. It seems likely that certain early life experiences will be found to be necessary conditions for very nurturant behavior toward children in men; but these early experiences probably must interact with later experiences during adolescence and adulthood for this behavior to manifest itself in an actual shared-caregiving situation.

Finally, returning to the theoretical argument (Dinnerstein, 1976)

that provided the original impetus for this research, the present study did not directly address Dinnerstein's contention that female-dominated child care is the major antecedent that perpetuates the prevailing unequal sex-role arrangements. This contention could be investigated empirically, however: A study of sex-role attitudes and behaviors in people raised from birth by a mother and father who shared caregiving equally would be necessary. The present study does suggest, however, that female-dominated child care is not the only early antecedent of traditional sex roles: Men were found who had been raised primarily by their mothers, yet they were breaking through the last frontier of the prevailing sex-role arrangements, the care of young children. The differences in the early antecedents that contribute to this unusual choice of child-care arrangement as opposed to the traditional arrangement chosen by most men (even those with ostensibly nonsexist attitudes) appear to be very subtle indeed--a difference in female dominance of early care does not appear to be among them. The finding of these exceptions does not, however, mean that female-dominated child care is not a very major factor in perpetuating sex-role, and specifically child-care, arrangements; a few exceptions do not disprove this hypothesis. Thus, the present study does provide some support for Dinnerstein's contention that subtle psychological processes occurring in infancy and early childhood are decisive for the way adults later construct their sex-role arrangements. It is hoped that future researchers will use the present investigation as a tentative guide to more thorough studies of fathers and mothers engaged in shared caregiving with infants and young children, which is a crucial aspect of the central human project of sexual liberty that Dinnerstein so well describes.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to provide an in-depth exploration of fathers in intact marriages who have a major role in the care of their infants or young children. Specifically, 15 of these fathers were compared to 15 fathers with a significant, but lesser, caregiving role with their children, in several aspects of personality, attitudes, and underlying motives, as well as possible antecedents (including childhood and adult experiences) of their choice of child-care arrangement.

It was hypothesized that the first group, "shared-caregiving" fathers, would be more androgynous and have higher intimacy motivation and lower power motivation than the other fathers, and that the shared-caregiving fathers' mothers would have been more androgynous than the other fathers' mothers. It was also expected that the shared-caregiving fathers would have had previous experiences which predisposed them to a caregiving role with their children.

On almost all of the measures, which included a Personal Data form, the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (a self-esteem measure), the Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire, the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, the Rosenkrantz et al. Sex-Role Questionnaire, and a detailed, structured interview, the two groups did not differ, yet their lifestyles were clearly different. The shared-caregiving fathers worked less and did almost all types of housework and child care more than the other

fathers. They relied mostly on parental care for their children, and they continued to share equally in child care when their wives were at home. The control group tended to rely on substitute caregivers more, so that they and their wives could both continue working, and they deferred to their wives in child care when both of them were at home. The control-group fathers seemed, however, to be much more involved in both child care and housework than most men.

There was a nonsignificant trend toward the shared-caregiving fathers' reporting themselves higher in feminine personality characteristics than the other fathers, suggesting that they may be more androgynous. More shared-caregiving fathers reported a lack of sex-role stereotyping in their parents' emphasis on the importance of marriage for them as opposed to their sisters. Shared-caregiving fathers tended to be middle- and last-born children, while the other fathers tended to be first-born and only children. The two latter findings were interpreted as being consistent with the idea that there were subtle experiences in shared-caregiving fathers' backgrounds that predisposed them to taking on the non-traditional role of caregiver for their young children.

A very tentative composite of a shared-caregiving father, based on a discriminant analysis, emerged: a man who is very egalitarian in his attitudes about women, who perceives himself as higher in feminine traits than most men, and who has a lower need for mastery and achievement in general than most men. The shared-caregiving fathers, as well as the other fathers, also appeared to be higher in intimacy motivation and lower in power motivation than most men. This profile should be treated with extreme caution, and it should serve a heuristic function for future

researchers.

The shared-caregiving fathers appeared to be more certain than other fathers in their conviction that there are no parental functions more suitable for mothers, and in their belief that dolls are appropriate toys for young boys. These findings were interpreted as indicating less adherence to subtle beliefs that perpetuate sex-role stereotyping.

The shared-caregiving fathers also tended to have had fathers who were either unavailable "workaholics" or who were fairly nurturant toward them; they felt that they were either modeling themselves after or rebelling against their fathers by becoming shared-caregiving fathers.

Two explanations for the dearth of differentiating variables were advanced: (a) The number of subjects was small, and (b) The control group was very involved with and nurturant toward their children; they were similar in many ways to the shared-caregiving group. It was suggested that future researchers either (a) use more subjects, (b) use a control group more representative of typical fathers, or (c) use more subtle measures in seeking to discover differences between two groups similar to those in this study. It was also suggested that a thorough study of the wives of shared-caregiving fathers, measuring many of the same variables included in and suggested by the present research, be undertaken, since their characteristics are likely to be one of the crucial variables antecedent to this rare child-care arrangement.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Bem, S. L. Psychology looks at sex roles: Where have all the androgynous people gone? Paper presented at the UCLA Symposium on Women, May 1972.
2. Radin, N. Childrearing fathers in intact families: An exploration of some antecedents and consequences. Paper presented at a study group on "The Role of the Father in Child Development, Social Policy, and the Law," sponsored by the Society for Research in Child Development and the University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel, July 14, 1980.
3. Russell, G. Fathers as caregivers: They could...if they had to. Paper presented at the 49th Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, Auckland, New Zealand, January 1979.
4. Radin, N. Childrearing fathers in intact families with preschoolers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (Revised), Toronto, September 1978.
5. Lind, J. Observations after delivery of communications between mother-infant-father. Paper presented at the Congress of the International Pediatric Association, Buenos Aires, 1974.
6. Hollingshead, A. B. Four factor index of social status. Working Paper, Yale University, June 1975. (Available from the author, P. O. Box 1965 Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut 06520).
7. McAdams, D. P. Scoring manual for the intimacy motive. Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University, 1979.
8. McAdams, D. P. Personal communication, August 1981.
9. McAdams, D. P. Personal communication, November 1981.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. D. S. The development of mother-infant attachment. In B. M. Caldwell & H. N. Ricciuti (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 3). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Atkinson, J. W. Motives in fantasy, action, and society: A method of assessment and study. Princeton, N. J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.
- Bandura, A. Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.
- Bem, S. L., & Lenney, E. Sex typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 48-54.
- Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.
- Berger, M., & Wright, L. Divided allegiance: Men, work, and family life. The Counseling Psychologist, 1978, 7, 50-52.
- Block, J. H. Another look at sex differentiation in the socialization behaviors of mothers and fathers. In J. Sherman & F. L. Denmark (Eds.), The psychology of women: Future directions in research. New York: Psychological Dimensions, 1978.
- Clarke-Stewart, K. And Daddy makes three: The father's impact on mother and young child. Child Development, 1978, 49, 466-478.
- Cohen, L. J., & Campos, J. J. Father, mother, and stranger as elicitors of attachment behaviors in infancy. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 146-154.
- Condry, J., & Condry, S. Sex differences: A study of the eye of the beholder. Child Development, 1976, 47, 812-819.

- DeFrain, J. Androgynous parents tell who they are and what they need. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 237-243.
- Dinnerstein, D. The mermaid and the minotaur: Sexual arrangements and human malaise. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Feldman, S. S., & Ingham, M. E. Attachment behavior: A validation study in two age groups. Child Development, 1975, 46, 319-330.
- Feldman, S. S., & Nash, S. C. Interest in babies during young adulthood. Child Development, 1978, 49, 617-622.
- Field, T. Interaction behaviors of primary vs. secondary caretaker fathers. Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 183-184.
- Frodi, A. M. Paternal-baby responsiveness and involvement. Infant Mental Health Journal, 1980, 1, 150-160.
- Frodi, A. M., & Lamb, M. E. Sex differences in responsiveness to infants: A developmental study of psychophysiological and behavioral responses. Child Development, 1978, 49, 1182-1188.
- Frodi, A. M., Lamb, M. E., Leavitt, L. A., Donovan, W. L., Neff, C., & Sherry, D. Fathers' and mothers' responses to the faces and cries of normal and premature infants. Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 490-498.
- Greenberg, M., & Morris, N. Engrossment: The newborn's impact upon the father. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1974, 44, 520-531.
- Haavio-Mannila, E. Convergences between East and West: Tradition and modernity in sex roles in Sweden, Finland, and the Soviet Union. In M. T. S. Mednick, S. S. Tangri, & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Women and achievement: Social and political analyses. New York: Wiley, 1975.
- Harlow, N. Sharing the children. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.
- Heilbrun, A. B. An exploration of antecedents and attributes of androgynous and undifferentiated sex roles. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1978, 132, 97-107.
- Helmreich, R. L., & Spence, J. T. The Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire: An objective instrument to assess components of achievement motivation and attitudes toward family and career. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1978, 8, 35. (Ms. No. 1677)

- Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. Short forms of the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI), an objective measure of self-esteem. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1974, 4, 473-475.
- Josselyn, I. M. Cultural forces, motherliness, and fatherliness. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1956, 26, 264-271.
- Klaus, M. H., & Kennell, J. H. Parent-to-infant attachment. In J. H. Stevens, Jr., & M. Mathews (Eds.), Mother/child, father/child relationships. Washington, D. C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1978.
- Komarovsky, M. Cultural contradictions and sex roles: The masculine case. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 873-884.
- Komarovsky, M. Dilemmas of masculinity in a changing world. In J. E. Gullahorn (Ed.), Psychology and women: In transition. New York: Wiley, 1979.
- Kotelchuck, M. The infant's relationship to the father: Experimental evidence. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development. New York: Wiley, 1976.
- Lamb, M. Effects of stress and cohort on mother- and father-infant interaction. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, 435-443.
- Lamb, M. E. The development of mother-infant and father-infant attachments in the second year of life. Developmental Psychology, 1977, 13, 637-649. (a)
- Lamb, M. E. Father-infant and mother-infant interaction in the first year of life. Child Development, 1977, 48, 167-181. (b)
- Lamb, M. E. The father's role in the infant's social world. In J. H. Stevens, Jr., & M. Mathews (Eds.), Mother/child, father/child relationships. Washington, D. C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1978.
- Laws, J. L. A feminist review of marital adjustment literature: The rape of the Locke. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 33, 483-516.
- LeMasters, E. E. Parents in modern America. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1970.
- Maccoby, E. E. Woman's sociobiological heritage: Destiny or free choice. In J. E. Gullahorn (Ed.), Psychology and women: In transition. New York: Wiley, 1979.

- McAdams, D. P. A thematic coding system for the intimacy motive. Journal of Research in Personality, 1980, 14, 413-432.
- McAdams, D. P. Studies in intimacy motivation. In A. J. Stewart (Ed.), Motivation and society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, in press.
- McAdams, D. P., & Powers, J. Themes of intimacy in behavior and thought. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1981, 40, 573-587.
- McClelland, D. C. Assessing human motivation. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1971.
- McClelland, D. C. Power: The inner experience. New York: Irvington, 1975.
- McClelland, D. C., & Steele, R. S. Motivation workshops. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Mitchell, D., Redican, W. K., & Gomber, J. Lessons from a primate: Males can raise babies. Psychology Today, April 1974, pp. 63-69.
- Nash, J. Historical and social changes in the perception of the role of the father. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development. New York: Wiley, 1976.
- Pannabecker, B. J., & Emde, R. N. Effect of extended contact on father-newborn interaction. Communicating Nursing Research, 1977, 10, 97-114.
- Parke, R. D., & O'Leary, S. E. Family interaction in the newborn period: Some findings, some observations, and some unresolved issues. In K. F. Riegel & J. A. Meacham (Eds.), The developing individual in a changing world (Vol. 2). Chicago: Aldine, 1976.
- Pedersen, F. A., & Robson, K. S. Father participation in infancy. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1969, 39, 466-472.
- Pleck, J. H. Men's family work: Three perspectives and some new data. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 481-488.
- Radin, N. Observed paternal behaviors as antecedents of intellectual functioning in young boys. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 369-376.
- Radin, N. Role-sharing fathers and preschoolers. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum, in press.

- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. Family enabling processes: The facilitating husband in dual-career families. In R. Gosling (Ed.), Support, innovation, and autonomy. London: Tavistock, 1973.
- Rebelsky, F., & Hanks, C. Fathers' verbal interaction with infants in the first three months of life. Child Development, 1971, 42, 63-68.
- Redican, W. K. Adult male-infant interactions in nonhuman primates. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development. New York: Wiley, 1976.
- Rosenkrantz, P. S., Vogel, S. R., Bee, H., Broverman, I. K., & Broverman, D. M. Sex role stereotypes and self concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.
- Ross, G., Kagan, J., Zelazo, P., & Kotelchuck, M. Separation protest in infants in home and laboratory. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 256-257.
- Russell, G. The father role and its relation to masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. Child Development, 1978, 49, 1174-1181.
- Russell, G. Fathers! Incompetent or reluctant parents? Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 1979, 15, 57-65.
- Russell, G. Shared-caregiving families: An Australian study. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum, in press.
- Rypma, C. B. Biological bases of the paternal response. The Family Coordinator, 1976, 25, 335-339.
- Sagi, A. Antecedents and consequences of various degrees of paternal involvement in childrearing: The Israeli project. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), Nontraditional families: Parenting and child development. Hillsdale, N. J.: Erlbaum, in press.
- Sawin, D. B., & Parke, R. D. Adolescent fathers: Some implications from recent research on parental roles. Educational Horizons, 1976, 55, 38-43.
- Seavey, C. A., Katz, P. A., & Zalk, S. R. Baby X: The effects of gender labels on adult responses to infants. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 103-109.
- Spelke, E., Zelazo, P., Kagan, J., & Kotelchuck, M. Father interaction and separation protest. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9, 83-90.

- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1973, 2, 219-220.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.
- Tavris, C. Who likes women's liberation--and why: The case of the unliberated liberals. Journal of Social Issues, 1973, 29, 175-198.
- Tavris, C., & Offir, C. The longest war: Sex differences in perspective. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.
- Toman, W. Family constellation: Its effects on personality and social behavior (3rd ed.). New York: Springer, 1976.
- Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language (Unabridged). Springfield, Mass.: Merriam, 1971.
- West, M. W., & Konner, M. J. The role of the father: An anthropological perspective. In M. E. Lamb (Ed.), The role of the father in child development. New York: Wiley, 1976.
- Winter, D. G. The power motive. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Winter, D. G., & Stewart, A. J. The power motive. In H. London & J. E. Exner, Jr. (Eds.), Dimensions of personality. New York: Wiley, 1978.
- Zelazo, P. R., Kotelchuck, M., Barber, L., & David, J. Fathers and sons: An experimental facilitation of attachment behaviors. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, New Orleans, March 16-20, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 139 546)

APPENDIX A

PERSONAL DATA

1. Age _____
2. Wife's age _____
3. Age when married (present marriage) _____
4. Wife's age when married _____
5. Have you been married before? _____ Yes _____ No
If Yes, how many times? _____
At what age? _____
For how long? _____
6. What is your level of education?
Less than high school _____
High school completed _____
Junior college degree or some years of college _____
College degree _____
Graduate or professional school degree _____
Other (Explain) _____
7. What is your wife's level of education?
Less than high school _____
High school completed _____
Junior college degree or some years of college _____
College degree _____
Graduate or professional school degree _____
Other (Explain) _____
8. What is your occupation (including homemaker or student)? Please describe if necessary.

9. Have you had any previous occupations during your adulthood?
_____ Yes _____ No
If so, what? _____
10. What is your wife's occupation? _____
11. Did your wife have any previous occupations during her adulthood?
_____ Yes _____ No
If so, what? _____

12. Please list your children, by sex and age. Indicate whether they attend school or preschool, and, if so, how many hours per week.

Sex Age School/Preschool Hours

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

13. What was your father's level of education?*

Less than high school _____

High school completed _____

Junior college degree or some years of college _____

College _____

Graduate or professional school degree _____

Other (Explain) _____

14. What was your mother's level of education?

Less than high school _____

High school completed _____

Junior college degree or some years of college _____

College _____

Graduate or professional school degree _____

Other (Explain) _____

15. Your father's occupation:

Now _____

While you were a child _____

16. Your mother's occupation:

Now _____

While you were a child _____

17. Please list the children in your family of origin (i.e., your brothers and sisters), with sex and current age. Put an * beside the number that indicates yourself.

Sex Age

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.

*"Father" refers to your biological father or to your primary male guardian. "Mother" refers to your biological mother or to your primary female guardian.

18. Your religion:

Now _____

While you were a child _____

19. Your ethnic background _____

20. How many hours per week do you work for pay? _____

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW

Do Number 3a first.

Part I.

1. a. How many hours per week are you the sole caregiver for your child (children) under 5 years old? (Note: "Sole caregiver" includes when wife is at home but is not available for child care.) _____
b. For how many of those hours is the child (children) awake? ____
c. What is your wife doing during this time?

d. For how many total hours per week, including the above but not including the time you are asleep, are you available for interaction with your child (children) under 5 years old? ____
2. a. What is your and your wife's current employment pattern (e.g., both work full-time, one works while other is at home, etc.)?

b. How long have you been in this pattern? _____
c. Did your employment pattern change when your first child was born? If so, how?

d. Did it change when a subsequent child was born?
3. a. What are your arrangements for child care for your child (children) under 5?

b. When did you decide on these arrangements?

c. Why did you decide on these arrangements?

d. Who was most responsible for deciding on these arrangements?

e. How long do you plan to continue with these arrangements?

f. Have you ever considered or wanted a different arrangement?
If so, what? Why haven't you changed?

g. What do you like or dislike about your current arrangement?

4. Of the total amount of time that you and your wife do each of the following activities with your child (children) under 5, approximately what percentage of the time does each of you do each activity?

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Percentage of time</u>	
	<u>Self</u>	<u>Wife</u>
a. Feeding	a.	
b. Diapering	b.	
c. Bathing	c.	
d. Dressing	d.	
e. Getting up in middle of night if child awakens	e.	
f. Reading stories	f.	
g. Taking child to doctor/dentist	g.	
h. Playing indoors	h.	
i. Playing outdoors	i.	
j. Playing with toys	j.	
k. Playing physically (tickling, rough-and-tumble, etc.)	k.	
l. Adult activities (shopping, cooking, cleaning, etc.) done with child	l.	

5. Of the total amount of time that you and your wife do each of the following household tasks, approximately what percentage of the time does each of you do each task?

<u>Task</u>	<u>Percentage of time</u>	
	<u>Self</u>	<u>Wife</u>
a. Taking out garbage	a.	
b. Cooking	b.	
c. Washing dishes	c.	
d. Laundry	d.	

- | | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| e. Vacuuming | e. |
| f. Cleaning | f. |
| g. Making beds | g. |
| h. Household repairs | h. |
| i. Clothes shopping for children | i. |
| j. Grocery shopping | j. |
| k. Car maintenance | k. |

6. When you and your wife are both at home, approximately what percentage of the time does each of you perform caregiving activities (e.g., bathing, diapering, feeding, putting to bed, not playing with or entertaining) with your child (children) under 5?

Self ____

Wife ____

Subject No. ____

Part II.

1. Did you attend pre-natal classes before any of your children were born? ____
2. What type of birth did you have for each of your children (standard hospital, Lamaze, etc.)?
3. Did you attend the birth? ____
4. How much did you participate in the care of your child (children) in the first 3 months after they were born?
5. Were your children planned? ____
6. How much have you read about child care or child development?
7. Many people believe that women are biologically more suited to care for babies and children than men, or that women have a "maternal instinct" while men do not. How do you feel about this?

If you do not believe that women are better suited for child care, how do you account for the different parental roles that men and women have in our society?

8. Whatever your feelings about biological suitability for child care, do you believe that fathers can function as adequately as mothers as caregivers for babies and young children? ____
9. What parental functions do you feel are more suitable for mothers?
10. What parental functions do you feel are more suitable for fathers?
11. Do you believe that little boys should be given dolls? Why or why not? (Probe.)
12. Do you believe that little girls should be given trucks? Why or why not? (Probe.)

13. How much involvement with young children did you have during your adulthood prior to becoming a parent?
14. Has your marital relationship been affected by the women's movement, the men's movement, and/or current societal shifts in the roles of men and women? If so, how?

Subject No. ____

Part III

1. Who took care of you the most when you were under 5 years old?
2. Please describe your relationship with your father when you were a young child (under 12 years old). (After subject has given answer, probe for following areas if not covered: amount of affection, amount of time spent with subject, how time was spent, discipline, talking to subject about subject's life, talking to subject about his life.)
3. Please describe your relationship with your mother when you were a young child (under 12 years old). (Probe as above.)
4. What kinds of arrangements did your parents have for child care?
5. Which of the following toys did you have as a child?

<u>Toy</u>	<u>Check</u>	<u>Toy</u>	<u>Check</u>
1. Stuffed animals		8. Cooking set	
2. Tea set		9. Tools	
3. Toy soldiers		10. Dolls	
4. Vacuum cleaner		11. Guns	
5. Trucks		12. Balls	
6. Dress-up clothes		13. Trains	
7. Cars		14. Important others?	
6. What kinds of games did you typically play when you were a child under 12?
7. What kinds of behaviors (e.g., crying, fighting, playing rough, being physically affectionate) did you typically engage in? In other words, what kind of child were you?
8. Were there any activities or behaviors that were especially encouraged or discouraged for you?
9. Were there any activities or behaviors that you would have liked to engage in more?

(Go back and probe on questions 6 through 9.)

6. Probe for "girls'" games: hopscotch, jumprope, jacks, house, etc.
 7. Probe for "girls'" behavior: crying, showing dependency, being affectionate, etc.
 8. Probe for encouragement of "masculine" activities and behaviors (e.g., not crying, being strong, sports), and for encouragement/discouragement of "feminine" activities and behaviors (e.g., dolls, playing house, dance lessons, taking care of younger children).
 9. Probe for "feminine" activities.
-
10. (If S has any sisters) What kinds of activities or behaviors were especially encouraged or discouraged for your sister(s)? (Probe for stereotyping and for encouragement of "masculine" behavior in sisters.)
 11. How, in general, were you and your sister(s) treated differently as far as:
 - a. types of toys
 - b. types of games encouraged/discouraged
 - c. encouragement of independence (roaming away from house, parents' anxiety about welfare, etc.)
 - d. pressure to achieve in school
 - e. occupational expectations
 - f. tolerance of aggression
 - g. child showing feelings (warmth, anger, crying)
 - h. household chores
 - i. expectations for marriage
 - j. general
 12. How much were you involved in competitive sports?
 13. Did you tend to hang around with a group of boys during your grammar school years?
 14. Were there any behaviors or activities typical of boys that you did not want to engage in? If so, how did your parents react?

15. As a child, did you ever have exclusive responsibility for the care of a pet?
16. As a child, did you ever have the experience of caring for younger children? For an adult (e.g., sick parent or elderly person)?
17. How did your parents spend their free time at home?
18. Were any males besides your father significantly involved in your upbringing?
19. How involved with you as a child were your grandparents? (Probe for grandfather involvement).
20. Did you have any male preschool teachers?
21. Did you have any male grammar school teachers? (Probe for other males involved in unusual ways.)
22. Did either of your parents read you bedtime stories? How often and which one?
23. Looking back on your entire life, what in general do you feel is the main reason or reasons you have chosen your current child care arrangement?

APPENDIX C

CODING KEY FOR INTERVIEW

2 = other, unavailable, or cannot tell from data

3 = S has no sisters (for questions 5 through 8)

Question 1 (Part II, #9): What parental functions do you feel are more suitable for mothers?

0 = SOMETHING IS MORE SUITABLE (S mentions any function or activity besides breastfeeding [nursing, feeding] or being a female role model even if S says this is due to training or experience or socialization, etc.)

1 = NOTHING (S says none OR breastfeeding only OR female role model only)

Question 2 (Part II, #11): Do you believe that little boys should be given dolls? Why or why not?

0 = CONDITIONAL YES (OR NO) (S expresses any kind of doubt or hesitation about the appropriateness of giving boys dolls--e.g., fear of homosexuality, concern about what other people will think, S wouldn't give a doll to his own son, a certain kind of doll is inappropriate, S would be alarmed at a certain intensity or length of time of a boy's interest in dolls)

1 = UNCONDITIONAL YES (S says yes without any doubt or hesitation or reservation [except S may say "If they want them"]; S may add that dolls are important toys or that he wants to combat sex role stereotypes)

Question 3 (Part III, #2, last probe): How much did your father talk to you about his life?

0 = MINIMAL SHARING OF FATHER'S LIFE (Little or no talking about father's life outside the family AND no mention of father sharing his outside life [e.g., outside work or recreation] with S)

1 = SOME SHARING OF FATHER'S LIFE (Moderate amount or more of father talking about his life outside the family OR mention of other kind of sharing of father's outside life--e.g., taking S to work with him)

Question 4 (Part III, #6): What kinds of games (or activities) did you typically play when you were a child under 12?

- 0 = STEREOTYPIC BOY (Sports were predominant OR being outside and very active was predominant, etc.)
- 1 = QUIET/SOCIAL (Quiet activities were predominant OR inside activities were predominant OR S emphasizes social/imagination play [e.g., cowboy, doctor, hide-and-seek, etc.] OR S mentions family activities)

Question 5 (Part III, #11g): ...child showing feelings (warmth, anger, crying)?

- 0 = STEREOTYPING (Expression of feelings was more tolerated or encouraged for sister[s] [with possible exception of anger] OR any other difference in reactions of parents to expression of feelings on part of S and sister[s])
- 1 = NO STEREOTYPING (No mention of above types of difference)

Question 6 (Part III, #11i): ...expectations for marriage?

- 0 = STEREOTYPING (There was more emphasis or focus on sister[s]'s marriage OR more importance was attached to it)
- 1 = NO STEREOTYPING (Equal amount of emphasis or lack thereof on marriage for S and sister[s])

Question 7 (Part III, #12): How much were you involved in competitive sports?

- 0 = TRADITIONAL/COMPETITIVE (S was involved a lot OR traditional [baseball, basketball, football] sports were predominant OR competition was very important to S OR formal organized team sports were predominant)
- 1 = NON-TRADITIONAL/NON-COMPETITIVE (S was involved none or very little OR less traditional [e.g., track, swimming] sports were predominant OR competition was not very important to S OR there was little emphasis on formal organized team sports)

Question 8 (Part III, #13): Did you tend to hang around with a group of boys during your grammar school years?

- 0 = UNQUALIFIED YES (S does not mention girls)
- 1 = QUALIFIED YES OR NO (S tended to be alone or S mentions girls as companions)

Question 9 (Part III, #18): Were any males besides your father significantly involved in your upbringing?

0 = FAMILY MEMBER (Significant involvement during upbringing by a male family member [e.g., uncle, grandfather, cousin] other than brother)

1 = NO FAMILY MEMBER (None OR no male family member OR brother only)

Question 10 (Part III, #19): How involved with you as a child were your grandparents?

0 = GRANDPARENT INVOLVEMENT (Moderate to great deal of interaction with at least one grandparent)

1 = NO GRANDPARENT INVOLVEMENT (None OR very little OR S expresses the feeling that interaction with grandparents was not significant for him)

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Charles Daniel Sirignano Wolfson has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Alan S. DeWolfe, Director
Professor, Psychology, Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Jeanne M. Foley
Professor, Psychology, Loyola University of Chicago

Dr. Dan P. McAdams
Assistant Professor, Psychology, Loyola University of
Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Date

12/4/81

Director's Signature

Alan S. DeWolfe